NARRATIVE IN DRAMA

THE ART OF THE EURIPIDEAN MESSENGER-SPEECH

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A.D. LEEMAN · H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM DECIMUM SEXTUM

IRENE J.F. DE JONG

NARRATIVE IN DRAMA

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

NARRATIVE IN DRAMA

THE ART OF THE EURIPIDEAN MESSENGER-SPEECH

BY

IRENE J.F. DE JONG

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1991

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jong, Irene J.F. de
Narrative in drama : the art of the Euripidean messenger-speech / by Irene J.F. de Jong.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; v. 116)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004094067 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Euripides—Characters—Messengers. 2. Euripides—Technique. 3. Messengers in literature. 4. Speech in literature. 5. Narration (Rhetoric) 6. Rhetoric, Ancient. I. Title. II. Series.
PA3978.J64 1991
882'.01—dc20 91-19528
CIP

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 09406 7

© *Copyright 1991 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands*

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, SALEM MA 01970, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface vii

1. The messenger-speech as a first-person narrative 1
1.1 Classification 1
'I' versus 'we' 3
'I'/'we' versus 'he'/'she'/'they' 5
The messenger as eyewitness 9
1.2 Restrictions 12
Restriction of place 13
Restriction of access 13
Restriction of understanding 14
Divine interventions 15
Temporary and permanent restriction of understanding 17
1.3 Getting round the restrictions 19
Getting round the restriction of place 19
Getting round the restriction of access 24
Getting round the restriction of understanding 29
1.4 Experiencing versus narrating focalization 30
how versus *what* 32
Experiencing focalization 35
Historic presents 38
Implicit anticipations (prolepses) 45
Narrating focalization 49
Dominant narrating focalization 52
1.5 Discrepant awareness 57
1.6 Conclusion. The messenger as 'I as witness'-narrator 60

2. The style of presentation 63
2.1 Scholars on objectivity 63
2.2 The messenger as character 65
2.3 The messenger as narrator 72
2.4 The messenger as focalizer 73
(i) Concluding evaluation 74
(ii) Interspersed criticism and engagement 77
(iii) Epithets 80

(iv) Comparisons 87
(v) Denomination 94
2.5 From presentation to reception 103
Signs of the 'you' 103
The messenger's own message 106
Reactions (1). The internal addressees 108
Reactions (2). The external addressees 110
2.6 Conclusion. The messenger and the "open perspective structure" of Euripidean tragedy 114

3. Narrative in drama 117
3.1 Why messenger-speeches? 117
The messenger-speech and the structure of the play 120
Messenger-speeches with preparatory function 122
Messenger-speeches with concluding function 123
Messenger-speeches with transitional function 128
Conclusion 130
3.2 The messenger-speech as drama 131
Direct speech 131
3.3 The messenger-speech as narrative 139
(i) Gestures and miens 140
(ii) Tone, sound and silence 144
(iii) Scenery 148
(iv) Objects 160
(v) Mediation 163
3.4 Conclusion. Telling versus showing 172

Appendix A: An inventory of messenger-speeches in Euripides 179
Appendix B: The messenger as eyewitness 183
Appendix C: Historical presents in the messenger-speech 185
Appendix D: The internal addressees of the messenger-speech . 189
Appendix E: Concluding evaluations 191
Appendix F: Comparisons 193
Appendix G: Signs of the 'you' 195
Appendix H: Direct and indirect speech 199

Bibliography 203
Index locorum 209

PREFACE

The messenger-speech forms a traditional element of Attic drama and there is no lack of scholarly research on this subject. We have three Latin dissertations dating from 1883 and 1910 (bis);[1] three more recent dissertations, which have, however, never been published;[2] studies dealing with particular aspects;[3] and some commentaries on the individual plays which contain general observations on messenger-speeches as well.[4] However, no single, up-to-date work of reference on the messenger-speech in Greek tragedy is available.

This book, consisting of three self-contained studies, aims at filling this void, albeit with some restrictions. In the first place, I deal primarily with the Euripidean messenger-speech, although Aeschylean and Sophoclean messenger-speeches[5] will be regularly adduced for comparison (in footnotes). In the second place, I concentrate on the messenger's continuous narrative, rather than on the messenger-scene as a whole, i.e. the combination of introductory dialogue and messenger-speech. Where necessary, however, the direct and remote context of the messenger-speech will be taken into consideration. It was in fact his role as narrator which originally attracted me to the figure of the tragic messenger.

The first study concerns the form of the messenger-speech, which is that of a first-person narrative, and the consequences of this form. A first-person narrator is more restricted in his perception and understanding of the events he recounts than an omniscient narrator, and I will examine the use which Euripides makes of this restriction.

[1] Fischl, Henning and Rassow. See also the paper (from 1899) by Bassi.

[2] Erdmann, Keller and Stanley-Porter.

[3] Barlow 1971 (scenery), Bremer 1976 (function), Di Gregorio (origin), Hourmouziades (scenery), Joerden (function of offstage area vs. onstage area), Ludwig (structure), Pathmanathan (function), Rijksbaron 1976a (beginning), Strohm (introductory dialogue).

[4] I think in particular of Collard on *Supp.* and Kannicht on *Hel.*

[5] Mainly A. *Pers.* 302-514, *Th.* 375-652, *A.* 636-80; S. *Aj.* 748-812, *Ant.* 407-40, 1192-1243, *OT* 1237-85, *Tr.* 749-812, 899-946, *El.* 680-763, *OC* 1586-1666. For my corpus of Euripidean messenger-speeches, see Appendix A.

The second study deals with the messenger's style of presentation, which scholars have described as objective and detached. In so doing they have underrated the role of the messenger as focalizer: "the one who sees".[6] The spectators do not see the events themselves but only see them through his eyes. This offers Euripides the opportunity to manipulate the presentation of events.

Central to the third study is the confrontation between narrative and drama, examined both syntagmatically (what is the place of the messenger's narrative in the dramatic context?) and paradigmatically (what are the differences between narrative and drama, and how does Euripides handle the narrativity of the messenger-speech?).

My analyses will take as their point of departure the messenger and his internal point of view. Needless to say, sentences like "the messenger uses technique x to reach effect y" or "the messenger chooses word x to convey meaning y" are in fact forms of shorthand, which in full would run: "Euripides makes the messenger use ..." and "Euripides makes the messenger choose ...". From time to time I will depart from this shortened formulation in order to consider each level of communication separately: the internal one (between messenger and chorus or chorus and one or more characters) and the external one (between Euripides and spectators and readers).[7]

My aim is to increase our insight into the narrative techniques of the Euripidean messenger-speech, and the ways in which Euripides exploits these techniques. Thus description will go hand in hand with interpretation, the former providing the necessary background to the latter. In the end, I hope to convince the reader that Grube's assessment of the

[6] According to Genette and Bal, we can in a narrative text distinguish between character (the one who causes or experiences the events), focalizer (the one who perceives, orders and interprets the events) and narrator (the one who verbalizes the focalized events): see De Jong 1987a: 31-40. The word 'focus' in 'focalization' should not be associated with the idea of 'emphasis', but with that of a lens through which events are refracted.

[7] For the two levels of communication, internal and external, see Pfister 3-4.

Euripidean messenger-speeches as brilliant but self-explanatory,[8] though meant to be complimentary, in fact wrongs them.

The Greek text used is that of Diggle (Oxford 1981, 1984) and Murray (Oxford 1913). For the purposes of this study literal translations were needed, which ruled out those of Lattimore a.o. and Vellacott (Penguin). I found the translations provided by the recent Aris & Phillips series of Euripides' plays best suited to my aims, and I have therefore used them in so far as they are available (D.J. Conacher for *Alc.*, M.J. Cropp for *El.*, E.J. Craik for *Ph.*, M.L. West for *Or.*). For *Ba.* I use the translation of G.S. Kirk. The remaining translations are mine. Secondary literature is referred to by author, or, in the case of more than one publication, by author and year of publication.

I am indebted to J.M. Bremer, Mrs. A.M. van Erp Taalman Kip, Mrs. E.J. Reijgwart, A. Rijksbaron, and especially C. Collard, for their comments and suggestions. The correction of the English text has been entrusted to Mrs. B.A. Fasting. Research for this study was made possible by a fellowship from the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

[8] E.g. on p. 162 ("his speech [of the messenger in *Med.*], which is one of the finest in Greek drama, ... needs little commentary"); 191 ("his speech [of the messenger in *Hipp.*], which is excellent, needs no comment"); 417 ("his speech [of the first messenger in *Ba.*], magnificent as it is, need not detain us"), etcetera.

CHAPTER ONE

THE MESSENGER-SPEECH AS A FIRST-PERSON NARRATIVE

In this chapter I will first show why Euripidean messenger-speeches may be classified as first-person narratives, and define as precisely as possible the position of the messenger as first-person narrator (1.1). I will then turn to one of the main characteristics of first-person narration: restriction, as opposed to omniscience. This comprises restriction of place (a first-person narrator can only be in one place at a time), access (he has no access to other characters' minds), and understanding (he may have only a partial or even a false understanding of what is happening around him). Section 1.2 discusses passages in which these restrictions are adhered to or even exploited by Euripides, while section 1.3 deals with passages in which they are evaded or even violated. A first-person narrator can choose to narrate the events exactly as he experienced and understood them at the time they took place, i.e. according to his experiencing focalization ("erlebendes Ich"), or to narrate according to his narrating focalization ("erzählendes Ich"), which means that he makes use of his *ex eventu* knowledge. In section 1.4 I will show that experiencing focalization is the rule in the corpus of Euripidean messenger-speeches. There are only a few — quite effective — exceptions, in which a messenger narrates according to his narrating focalization. In section 1.5 I turn my attention from the messenger to the other characters involved in the events reported, and to his internal and external addressees; I examine their foreknowledge and understanding, which may differ from his.

1.1 Classification

The Euripidean messenger-speech or ἀγγελικὴ ῥῆσις is a long, continuous speech in which a messenger reports events that have taken

place off-stage.[1] The content of this speech is a narrative, more particularly a first-person narrative, as may be illustrated by the messenger-speech in *Hipp.*:

> ἡμεῖς μὲν ἀκτῆς κυμοδέγμονος πέλας
> ψήκτραισιν ἵππων ἐκτενίζομεν τρίχας
> κλαίοντες
>
> δοῦλος μὲν οὖν ἔγωγε σῶν δόμων, ἄναξ,
> ἀτὰρ τοσοῦτόν γ' οὐ δυνήσομαί ποτε,
> τὸν σὸν πιθέσθαι παῖδ' ὅπως ἐστὶν κακός,
> ...· ἐπεί νιν ἐσθλὸν ὄντ' ἐπίσταμαι.
>
> We were combing our horses' hair near the wave-receiving shore, weeping
>
> I am only a slave in your household, king, but I shall never be able to believe such a monstrous thing, that your son is base, ...: for I know him to be noble.
>
> (*Hipp.* 1173-5, 1249-54)

Narratologists define a first-person narrative as a narrative told by a narrator who is himself a participant in the events he is narrating, while the degree of his participation may vary.[2] In the terminology of Bal and Genette,[3] a first-person narrative is a narrative recounted by one of its characters (C), who functions as narrator (N) and focalizer (F): N=F=C. Thus where the Euripidean messenger plays a role — however modest — in the events he recounts, and his narrative accordingly can be termed a first-person narrative, the narrator of, say, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* does not play a role in the events he recounts and, although he occasionally refers to himself as 'I', his narrative is not a first-person narrative.[4]

[1] For an inventory of Euripidean messenger-speeches, see Appendix A, which also sets forth my criteria for considering a speech a messenger-speech. The Aeschylean messenger-speeches are not continuous, while the Sophoclean are.

[2] Theoretical literature on the first-person narrative: Friedman 1174-5, Romberg, Stanzel 1964: 25-39 and 1982: 109-48, 257-85, Prince 13-5, Glowinski, Lintvelt 79-99.

[3] See my Preface, note 6.

[4] Of the Aeschylean messenger-speeches only *Pers.* 480-514 and *A.* 636-80 are first-person narratives, of the Sophoclean ones only *Ant.* 407-40, 1192-1243, *OT*

Two important characteristics of first-person narration which are a direct consequence of the participation of the narrator in the events are: (1) his presentation is engaged or even biased, and (2) his presentation is restricted, which means that he is not an omnipresent and omniscient narrator, as is the narrator of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, for example. In this chapter I will examine the second characteristic (restriction), while the first (engaged presentation) will be covered in chapter two.

Up to now, classical scholars have not discussed the Euripidean messenger-speech, or the relevant Aeschylean and Sophoclean speeches listed in note 4, in terms of a first-person narrative. Erdmann 7 calls the messenger "ein dramatischer Erzähler", as opposed to the "epische Erzähler".[5] However, the characteristics of such a 'dramatic narrative' which he mentions ("Abhängigkeit des 'dramatischen Erzählers' vom dramatischen Geschehen, verengte Perspektive, Parteilichkeit"), are the same as those mentioned above in connection with a first-person narrative. Interestingly enough, the literary theorist Friedman does refer to the messenger-speech in the context of first-person narratives (see p. 8).

Before turning to my main subject, the restrictions of first-person narration, I will define more precisely the position of the Euripidean messenger as first-person narrator.

'I' versus 'we'

Let us take a closer look at the opening and closing lines of the messenger-speech in *Hipp.* as quoted above. We see that the Messenger[6] refers to himself both as 'I' and as 'we'. This 'we' is not a royal we,[7] but

1237-85, and *OC* 1586-1666.

[5] See Rassow 33-40, Fischl 38-46 and Henning 43-4 for a comparison of messenger-speech and epic. Erdmann 90 mentions in passing that the messenger-speech "als Ich-Erzählung angelegt ist", but does not further pursue this point. Barlow 1986: 14 — in my opinion incorrectly — refers to the messenger-speech as a third-person narrative (see note 1, Ch. 2).

[6] I will use messenger for the messenger in general and Messenger for a particular Messenger in a particular play.

[7] This is the 'we' which is often found in Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond*, e.g. "The Court Lady with whom our plan was concerted, ..., the Court physician, and the Bishop of Rochester, who were the other two most active

indicates a group of persons, here servants of Hippolytus. In the entire messenger-speech we find more first-person plural than first-person singular predicates: ἐκτενίζομεν (1174), ἐστήσαμεν (1187), εἱπόμεσθα (1196), εἰσεβάλλομεν (1198), εἴδομεν (1206), ἐλειπόμεσθα (1244); as against δυνήσομαι (1250) and ἐπίσταμαι (1254). The same is true of most other messenger-speeches.[8] The explanation is that the Euripidean messenger is a servant, soldier, sailor, farmer or herdsman, who has participated in the events he is reporting as one of a group of servants, soldiers, etc. Thus 'we' indicates the messenger together with his fellow servants, fellow soldiers, etc. Sometimes it also includes one of the protagonists of his story, as in *Andr.* 1085 (ἤλθομεν), 1087 (ἐξεπίμπλαμεν), 1102 (ᾖμεν, ἐφέσταμεν), where 'we' is Neoptolemus and his servants, among them the Messenger.[9] In two cases 'we' stands for a clearly defined group of persons:

λέπας Κιθαιρώνειον εἰσεβάλλομεν
Πενθεύς τε κἀγώ — δεσπότῃ γὰρ εἰπόμην —
ξένος θ' ὃς ἡμῖν πομπὸς ἦν θεωρίας.

we were striking into the uplands of Cithaeron, Pentheus and I — for I was following my master — and the stranger who was escort in our mission.
(*Ba.* 1045-7, transl. G.S. Kirk)

and

ἐς δ' ἄλλας πύλας
ἠπειγόμεσθα, τοῦτο παύσαντες νοσοῦν.

and to other gates we [Eteocles and Messenger] hurried, when we had checked this trouble.
(*Ph.* 1170-1, transl. E. Craik)

participators in our plan, had held many councils in our house ...".

[8] Out of a total of 118 first-person predicates occurring in Euripidean messenger-speeches, 74 are plural. The messenger-speeches in *Andr.*, *El.*, *IT* (1), *Ph.* (4) contain only plural predicates; those in *Hec.*, *Supp.*, *Or.* (2) only singular ones. The Aeschylean and Sophoclean first-person messenger-speeches are all in the 'we'-form, with the exception of *Ant.* 1196.

[9] Cf. *El.* 774, 775, 790, where 'we' includes Orestes and Pylades, and *IT* 1327 (Iphigeneia, Orestes, Pylades).

Only rarely does a messenger-speech recount the individual action of a messenger. There is Talthybius, who in *Hec.* 529-33 describes how he called to silence the assembled Greeks, and even quotes in direct speech his own words spoken on that occasion: Σιγᾶτ', 'Αχαιοί, σῖγα πᾶς ἔστω λεώς, σίγα σιώπα (532-3).[10] Then there is *Ba.* 728-30, where the Messenger tells how Agave turned up near his hiding-place, and how he leapt out to seize her ('ξεπήδησ' ὡς συναρπάσαι θέλων). But his courage is short-lived, and he soon turns to flight (and to the plural again!): ἡμεῖς ... φεύγοντες ἐξηλύξαμεν (734). Finally, the Messenger of *Or.* (1) after a solo beginning (ἐτύγχανον, ὁρῶ, ἠρόμην, ὁρῶ), is lost in the crowd from 884 onwards (ἐπεὶ δὲ πλήρης ἐγένετ' 'Αργείων ὄχλος). Other first-person singular predicates refer either to the messenger's function as narrator or as focalizer, to which I will return later.

But messenger-speeches do not contain only first-person predicates.

'I'/'we' versus 'he'/'she'/'they'

Euripidean messengers usually refer to themselves (using either 'I' or 'we') at the beginning and at the end of their stories, while in between they tend to fade into the background.[11] In the messenger-speech in *Hipp.*, for example, we find five first-person predicates between the opening and closing lines, as against twenty-five third-person ones. This same pattern 'I'/'we' — 'he'/'she'/'they' — 'I'/'we' is found in all messenger-speeches,[12] although there are differences in the degree to which the 'I'/'we' becomes visible in the story.

[10] In *Ph.* 1224, which is a comparable situation, we find only a brief speech-act mention: κελεύσας σῖγα κηρῦξαι στρατῷ. *Hec.* 529-30 (σημαίνει δέ μοι σιγὴν 'Αχαιῶν παντὶ κηρῦξαι στρατῷ) in itself would have been enough, but Talthybius takes advantage of his position as narrator, and in his report pays lavish attention to his own role.

[11] Of the 22 Euripidean messenger-speeches, eight open with a first-person predicate (*Heracl.* 801, *Hipp.* 1174, *Andr.* 1085, *El.* 774, *IT* 261, 1327, *Or.* 866, *Ba.* 1044); five close with one (*Hipp.* 1254, *Hec.* 582, *HF* 1015, *Hel.* 619, *Ba.* 1151): cf. Erdmann 90 and Bond ad *HF* 1010ff.

[12] And it also appears in many other first-person narratives, see Stanzel 1982: 109-48.

At one end, there is a messenger-speech like *IT* 260-339, where the group of herdsmen to which the Messenger belongs plays a considerable role, as the following analysis shows:

'I'/'WE'	'HE'/'THEY'
When we were driving down our cattle to ...	
there one of us saw two men and said: ...	
another of us prayed: ...	
yet another laughed and said that ...	
we decided to hunt the two	
	at that moment one of the strangers [Orestes] stood up, shook his head, groaned and shouts: ...
it was not possible to see ...	
	but he wirled around ...
we sat in silence, cowering low	
	but he smites the cattle with his sword
everybody armed himself, as we see the cattle being slaughtered, calling to help locals	
for we considered ourselves inferior fighters compared with these young men	
in short time we became a large group	
	the stranger falls down
as we saw him fall, we threw stones	
	but the other stranger [Pylades] wiped off the foam, tended his friend's body and covered it with his cloak
	the stranger, coming to himself, saw the oncoming surge of enemies and groaned: ...
but we do not stop throwing stones	
then we heard a terrible admonition: ...	
as we saw the swords of the enemy we fled	
	but if some fled, others tried to hit the strangers. If the strangers pushed these

	back, those that had yielded hurled stones
it was incredible (sc. for me/us)	
nobody was able to hit them	
we overpower them not by boldness, but we knocked the sword out of their hands	
	they sank their knees to the earth, exhausted
we bring them to the king of this country	
	he, seeing them, sent them to you

The prominence of the Messenger and his fellow herdsmen in this narrative is functional, in that it makes clear to Iphigeneia the excellence of the two men, who were only overpowered with great difficulty. Their very excellence[13] makes them, according to the Messenger, the ideal victims to atone for Iphigeneia's sacrifice in Aulis (336-9).

The other extreme is represented by the messenger-speech in *Ion*, which contains only one first-person predicate (1194), or those in *Ph.* (2), (3), and *Alc.*, which have none at all. In *Alc.*, the Messenger should be understood as included in the third-person plural of 192 (πάντες δ' ἔκλαιον οἰκέται κατὰ στέγας δέσποιναν οἰκτίροντες),[14] which is not difficult after her introduction in 136-7 as ἀλλ' ἥδ' ὀπαδῶν ἐκ δόμων τις ἔρχεται δακρυρροοῦσα. The self-effacement of this Messenger seems intended not to give the story "den Anschein größeren Objektivität",[15] but to concentrate as much as possible on the figure of Alcestis, who is portrayed here before she enters the stage in 244.[16]

[13] Cf. τοιάδ'... ξένων σφάγια (336-7) and ξένους τοιούσδε (337-8).

[14] Cf. *Hipp.* 1185 (πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἠπείγετο); *IT* 301-3 (πᾶς τις, ὡς ὁρᾷ ..., ἐξωπλίζετο), 329 (οὐδεὶς ... εὐτύχει βαλών), *Or.* 1416-7 (ἀνὰ δὲ δρομάδες ἔθορον ἔθορον ἀμφίπολοι Φρύγες), where the Messenger also uses a third-person predicate to refer to himself and his colleagues. Stanzel 1982: 135-8 discusses other first-person narratives with both 'I' and 'he' predicates (notably *The History of Henry Esmond*). Lintvelt 94 mentions: Xenophon *Anabasis*, Thucydides *Historiae*, Caesar *Bellum Gallicum*.

[15] Erdmann 90, n. 2.

[16] See also pp. 122.

The other messenger-speeches are situated somewhere between these two extremes. Whatever the degree of participation of the messenger, he is never the protagonist of his own narrative. This observation makes it possible to define his position as first-person narrator more precisely. Narratologists distinguish between 'I as protagonist'-narrators and 'I as witness'-narrators:

> the first type is the most usual and the oldest; it is the fictional, autobiographical first-person novel in which the main character himself narrates his life, or portions of it ...
> the other main type of first-person novel is the one in which the narrator is not identical with the main character, but is instead a character who stands at some distance away from the center of the action and interest.[17]

Thus first-person narratives such as Odysseus' "Ich-Erzählungen" in *Od.* 9-12, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, Dickens' *Great Expectations*, and Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond* belong to the first category; Mann's *Doktor Faustus* and Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* to the second. It is clear that the first-person narratives of tragic messengers also belong to the second category. The literary theorist Friedman (1175, n. 20) did, in fact, tentatively place them there:

> One may speculate, if he wishes, as to the relation between the "I" as Witness frame in fiction and the convention of the messenger in Greek drama. E.g. the re-telling of the catastrophe at the end of Oedipus Rex or Oedipus at Colonus by an eyewitness.

The characterization of the messenger as 'I as witness'-narrator is doubly apt, because being an eyewitness is the messenger's very theatrical *raison d'être*.

[17] Romberg 58, 61. See further Friedman 1174-5, Stanzel 1964: 26-7. Later, narratologists began to distinguish more than two types of first-person narrators (see Prince 15, Stanzel 1982: 257-99), but "der periphere Ich-Erzähler" (Stanzel 1982: 262-7) has remained.

The messenger as eyewitness

The messenger tells other characters on stage (and the spectators in the theatre) what they have not seen themselves.[18] Thus, the chorus of *Supp.* asks him:

> πῶς γὰρ τροπαῖα Ζηνὸς Αἰγέως τόκος
> ἔστησεν οἵ τε συμμετασχόντες δορός;
> λέξον· παρὼν γὰρ οὐ παρόντας εὐφρανεῖς.
>
> for how did the son of Aegeus and his allies gain victory? Tell us: for you who have been present will give joy to us who were not present.
>
> (*Supp.* 647-9)[19]

The majority of messengers refer explicitly to their activity as eyewitnesses. In *IT* (1), for example, we have ἐσείδομεν (308), ἠκούσαμεν (320) and εἴδομεν (323).[20] A more emphatic description is given by the Messenger of *Supp.*:

> ... ἀμφὶ δ' Ἠλέκτρας πύλας
> ἔστην θεατὴς πύργον εὐαγῆ λαβών.
> ὁρῶ δὲ ...
>
> I posted myself at Electra's gate as a spectator, on a tower which offers a good view. And I see ...
>
> (*Supp.* 651-3)

[18] For the reason why certain events must remain unseen, see Ch. 3. Note how the chorus of *Supp.* wish to be eyewitnesses themselves (618-22).

[19] Cf. Horace *Ars Poetica* 183-4: *multaque tolles ex oculis, quae mox narret facundia praesens*. The most plausible interpretation of *facundia praesens* is *f. praesentis nuntii*, and *praesens* has the same 'imperfect' meaning as πάρων in Greek (for which see Collard 1975, ad *Supp.* 647-9).

[20] A complete inventory of Euripidean references is given in Appendix B. See also Bassi 81-2, Fischl 34-5, Henning 18-23, Erdmann 89-90. Aeschylean and Sophoclean messengers — even those whose report does not have the form of a first-person narrative — also refer to their status as eyewitness: A. *Pers.* 266-7, *Th.* 490, *A.* 659; S. *Aj.* 748, *Ant.* 404, 1192, 1220, 1221, *OT* 1254, 1263, *Tr.* 746-7, 899, 912, 914-5, *El.* 761-3, *OC* 1648.

Calling himself θεατής, this Messenger defines as it were his own function vis-à-vis the spectators in the theatre: he temporarily replaces them as spectator and looks *for* them at an off-stage drama, a θέαμα.[21]

In addition to such direct references to the messenger's function as eyewitness, in the form of verbs of seeing and hearing, there are also more indirect ones, e.g.

> χθὼν φθέγματος πληρουμένη
> φρικῶδες ἀντεφθέγγετ'
>
> the earth, filled with the roaring [sc. of the bull], resounded frightfully
> (*Hipp.* 1215-6)

Although there is no verb of hearing, the qualification 'frightfully' implies the presence of someone who hears (and is frightened by) the sound of the bull roaring. See in this same speech φρικώδη κλύειν (1202) and δεινὰ ... κλύειν (1239).[22]

Only once, in the case of Iolaus' pursuit of Eurystheus and his magic rejuvenation (*Heracl.* 849-63), does a messenger not rely on his own eyes, but recounts what he has heard from others.[23] The change from autopsy to hearsay is marked emphatically:

[21] Of the eight times this word is found in Euripides, it occurs five times in a messenger-speech: *Med.* 1167 and 1202, *Ph.* 1139, *Or.* 952, *Ba.* 760. Also, the content of the messenger's narrative is occasionally referred to as τὰ δρώμενα (*IT* 1295, *Ph.* 1334, 1358, and cf. τοῖς δεδραμένοις in *HF* 1012). Cf. also the expression 'to see by means of messengers' in *Heracl.* 392, where the dative ἀγγέλοισι instead of δι' ἀγγέλων indicates, according to Pearson *ad loc.*, that "the messengers are treated as instruments of vision". In *Ba.* (2) the idea of the messenger-speech as an offstage drama is thematized in the form of a 'play within a play': see Foley 1980, 1985: 223-34. Cf. also Burnett 1971: 117 (on the messenger-speech of *Ion*): "As the messenger slowly sets the imaginary stage, a powerful sense of anticipation is created and with it the conviction that the piece to be mounted in such sacredness will be a kind of miracle play."

[22] Chapter 3, pp. 146-7 offers a more detailed analysis of the sound effects in this messenger-speech.

[23] *Supp.* 655 (ὡς μὲν ἦν λόγος), *Heracl.* 856-7 (λέγουσι ... οἱ σοφώτεροι), *Ion* 1139 (ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ σοφοί), and *Or.* 872-3 (φασι) are different, in that the messenger relies on others only for certain details, not for events. One is reminded of the φασί-passages in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (see De Jong 1987a: 48 and 236-8). For the φασι of *Ion* 1185, see p. 15.

τἀπὸ τοῦδ' ἤδη κλύων
λέγοιμ' ἂν ἄλλων, δεῦρό γ' αὐτὸς εἰσιδών.

what follows now I can tell because I heard it from others, so far having witnessed things myself.

(*Heracl.* 847-8)

This emphasis reflects the traditional topos of 'autopsy being a more reliable source of information than hearsay', which goes back to Homer and Herodotus.[24] The topos is also voiced by the Messenger of *Supp.* (λεύσσων δὲ ταῦτα κοὐ κλύων: 684)[25] and underlies the following explanatory remark of the Messenger of *Ph.* (1):

παρῆν δ' ἑκάστου τῶνδέ μοι θεάματα
ξύνθημα παρφέροντι ποιμέσιν λόχων.

Scrutiny of each of these men was possible for me, as I took a message to the shepherds of our companies.

(*Ph.* 1139-40, transl. E.J. Craik)

It is, I believe, no coincidence that, while all messengers are by their very nature eyewitnesses, these three messengers — in *Heracl.*, *Supp.* and *Ph.* (1) — who are all reporting battles, place such emphasis on their autopsy. They pose as pseudo historians, who, like their illustrious colleagues Homer and Herodotus, take pains to stress the veracity of their account. Their emphatic statements are perhaps also intended to stifle a certain scepticism about the practical possibility of one man witnessing all that has taken place on a large battlefield.[26] Such scepticism is voiced both by Theseus in *Supp.* 846-56 and by Orestes in *El.* 377-8.[27] In the case of two of his three 'war reporters' Euripides has

[24] E.g. *Il.* 2.484-7, *Od.* 8.487-91, *Histories* II 44, 75, 106, 148 (and passim), and see Schepens. For tragic instances, see Page ad *Med.* 652 and cf. Müller-Goldingen 171, n. 3. For his addressees, the messenger's report is of course hearsay, cf. τάδ' εἶδον αὐτὴ κοὐ κλύουσ' ἀπ' ἀγγέλων (*IT* 901).

[25] And by the messengers of A. *Pers.* (266) and S. *Tr.* (746-7).

[26] The omniscient and omnipresent presenter of the *Iliad*, who is helped by the Muses, does not have this problem, although at times he seems overwhelmed by the vast quantity of facts to be related (12.175-8).

[27] The passage *El.* 373-9 was deleted by Wilamowitz. There is a good note on *Supp.* 846-56 in Collard 1975.

taken care to counter this scepticism. He has made the Messenger in *Supp.* a prisoner of war (635-7), who, finding himself in Thebes, is able to watch the battle from a strategic position, the Electran gate (651-2). The Messenger of *Ph.* (1) is a shieldbearer of Eteocles (1073-4), who brings the password round (1139-40) and follows his master criss-cross over the battlefield (1164, 1170-1). Only the Messenger in *Heracl.* covers the action on the battle-field as a whole with no further explanation,[28] except for Iolaus' pursuit of Eurystheus. His omnipresence is conventional, the convention having been established in the *Iliad* (see note 26).

In discussing the autopsy of the three war-reporting messengers, I have in fact already touched upon the restrictions of first-person narration.

1.2 Restrictions

The presenter of a first-person narrative is a character, that is to say, (generally speaking) a human being, who 1) can only tell what he sees himself, depending on where he finds himself (the restriction of *place*); 2) has no more than ordinary access to the minds of other characters (the restriction of *access*); and 3) does not necessarily understand everything he sees (the restriction of *understanding*).[29] These restrictions are often cleverly exploited, as in the Sherlock Holmes stories by Conan Doyle, first-person narratives with an 'I as witness'-narrator, Dr. Watson. Watson is often left on his own by Holmes for longer periods, during which he knows nothing of what his friend is doing. Often he is also at a loss to know what is going on in the mind of his friend, as the latter paces up and down their rooms at Baker Street, sits smoking or plays his violin. And finally, he is not gifted with the same deductive talents as his much admired friend. As a result of Watson's restricted narration, Holmes' solutions come as much as a surprise to the reader as they do

[28] At the opening of his speech the Messenger even seems to place himself in the position of the leaders of both sides (Heraclids + Athenians and Argives): ἐπεὶ ... ἀλλήλοισιν ὁπλίτην στρατὸν ... ἀντετάξαμεν (800-1), and cf. 831 (συνῆψαν ἀλλήλοις μάχην). In 786 (νικῶμεν) and 842 (ἐτρεψάμεσθ') the 'we' is clearly Heraclids + Athenians only.

[29] See Friedman 1174, Romberg 59, Stanzel 1964: 30 and 1982: 122.

to Watson. I will now look at these three restrictions in the Euripidean messenger-speech.

Restriction of place

In the Euripidean messenger-speech the restriction of place plays only a minor role, since the events reported usually occur at one location only. We have already seen that, when that location is extensive (a battle-field), Euripides takes care in two of the three cases to give the messenger a high (*Supp.*) or ambulant (*Ph.* (1)) position.[30] In *IT* 1330 the Taurian sailor-Messenger is sent away from the main location of events, but here the restriction of place forms a functional element of the plot.

Moreover, the messenger is a messenger precisely because he happens to have seen certain things,[31] and to limit him too much in this respect would run counter to his theatrical function as 'stand-in' spectator. This also explains why this restriction is sometimes violated, the messenger reporting events he cannot actually have seen, as we shall see later on in this chapter.

Restriction of access

The restriction of access is of no great importance either, since the characters in messengers' stories, like those in the Homeric epics, usually express their inner thoughts aloud (in direct speech), e.g.

> χὼ μὲν σκυθράζει, δεσπότης δ' ἀνιστορεῖ·
> Τί χρῆμ' ἀθυμεῖς; Ὦ ξέν', ὀρρωδῶ τινα
> δόλον θυραῖον. ἔστι δ' ἔχθιστος βροτῶν
> Ἀγαμέμνονος παῖς πολέμιός τ' ἐμοῖς δόμοις.

[30] Aeschylus has solved this problem differently in *Pers.* 353-432 (sea battle at Salamis), by not giving the messenger-speech the form of a first-person narrative.

[31] Note that even when in *IT* 1336-43 the Messenger could not see what Iphigeneia did, he can report what he heard her doing (ἀνωλόλυξε, κατῆδε).

Aegisthus scowled, but my master enquired, "What puts you out of temper?" — "Stranger, I dread some alien guile. Agamemnon's son is the man most at enmity with me, a foe to my house."

(*El.* 830-3, transl. M.J. Cropp)

Moreover, as we shall see, the Euripidean messenger tends to infer other characters' thoughts and motives from their actions or words.

Restriction of understanding

This is the most important and most common restriction, which is found for example in:

ἔνθεν τις ἠχὼ χθόνιος, ὡς βροντὴ Διός,
βαρὺν βρόμον μεθῆκε, ...
..., παρ' ἡμῖν δ' ἦν φόβος νεανικὸς
πόθεν ποτ' εἴη φθόγγος.

and then some sort of rumbling of the earth, like Zeus' thunder, sent forth a deep roaring ...
... and a mighty fear overtook us all, as to where the sound came from.

(*Hipp.* 1201-5)

and

διπλοῦς δ' ὀπαδοῖς ἦν γέλως φόβος θ' ὁμοῦ,
καί τις τόδ' εἶπεν, ἄλλος εἰς ἄλλον δρακών·
Παίζει πρὸς ἡμᾶς δεσπότης ἢ μαίνεται;

and both laughter and fear betook us, his [Heracles'] servants, and somebody said this, while we looked at each other: is our master making fun with us or has he gone mad?

(*HF* 950-2)[32]

[32] Other examples: *Hipp.* 1248, *IT* 1340-1, *Hel.* 1549-51, *Or.* 1418-24 (and cf. the restrictions in the pseudo messenger-speech of *Ba.* 616-41: 629, 638). See Fischl 40, Henning 18, Erdmann 7. In form *HF* 950-2 resembles a Homeric (actual) *tis*-speech (see De Jong 1987b). The expression καί τις τόδ' εἶπεν recurs in *Andr.* 1104 and *Hel.* 1589. According to Kannicht ad Hel. 1589, and cf. Bond ad *HF* 950-2, all three passages are "formal und funktionel dem epischen Formelvers B 271 usw. nachgebildet". I disagree where *Andr.* 1104 is concerned, since here the expression introduces a question asked of Neoptolemus by a single Delphian. It is characteristic of *tis*-speeches that they contain words which are supposed to have been uttered by a

In *Hipp.* the servants do not know about Theseus' curse (given to him and executed by Poseidon), and the servant-Messenger describes what he heard in terms of natural phenomena: it sounded like a seismic rumbling, like Zeus' thunder. In *HF* the servants do not know of the madness which Hera (through Iris and Lyssa) has sent to Heracles. The following is a somewhat different case:

> ἔδωκε πλῆρες τεῦχος, εἰς οἶνον βαλὼν
> ὅ φασι δοῦναι φάρμακον δραστήριον
> δέσποιναν
>
> he [the Old Man] gave the cup, full, after he had poured into the wine the strong poison they say my mistress had given him
>
> (*Ion* 1184-6)

Here φασι does not indicate that the Messenger is unsure of his information, as in 1216 the Old Man makes a full confession, mentioning Creusa's name. Rather it is expressive of his feelings: he simply cannot believe that his mistress has done such a thing.[33]

There is one group of passages in particular which nicely illustrate the messenger's restricted understanding: divine interventions.

Divine interventions

Here, the messenger does not have the omniscience of the narrators of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, to whom the comings and goings of the Olympians are no secret, and he sometimes expresses himself somewhat vaguely:

> ἐκ δ' αἰθέρος φωνή τις, ὡς μὲν εἰκάσαι
> Διόνυσος, ἀνεβόησεν
>
> from the upper air a voice — Dionysus as one may guess — cried out
>
> (*Ba.* 1078-9, transl. G.S. Kirk)[34]

number of speakers who are not officially addressing anyone, but speaking to their neighbours.

[33] Cf. Rassow 36: "Ac tanta est pietate in dominam suam, ut eo ipso narrationis momento, ubi veneni in vinum iniecti mentio fit, dubium sibi videri indicet, num ab Creusa venenum re vera datum sit".

[34] Cf. Dodds: "ὡς μὲν εἰκάσαι, implying the unexpressed antithesis τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν".

or

> πρὶν δή τις ἀδύτων ἐκ μέσων ἐφθέγξατο
> δεινόν τι καὶ φρικῶδες
>
> until somebody shouted from the heart of the adyton something terrible and frightening
>
> (*Andr.* 1147-8)[35]

In *Ba.* the Messenger cannot see who is speaking but infers from the words spoken (1079-81) — in particular ὄργια[36] — that it must be Dionysus. Although the Messenger in *Andr.* does not mention the name of Apollo in 1147 — he is, after all, not in the adyton — his concluding words (1161-5) imply that he is thinking of that god here.

Sometimes the messenger's understanding of divine interventions is demonstrably right, as in *Ba.* 1078-9, quoted above, or in *Ion* 1118, where the Messenger's idea that it was Apollo who saved Ion's life is confirmed by the *deus ex machina* Athena in 1565.[37] Sometimes his interpretation is not confirmed elsewhere in the play: thus Apollo's complicity as suggested by the Messenger of *Andr.* is not confirmed by the *deus ex machina* Athena, and neither Orestes' words in 1005-8 nor Peleus' lamentation in 1212 can be quoted as reliable evidence.[38] Again, the suggestion of the Messenger of *IT* (2) that it is Poseidon who has sent the wind which prevents Iphigeneia and Orestes from escaping (1414-9, deleted by England), is not confirmed: the *deus ex machina*

[35] Cf. Stevens: "The indefinite τις is used elsewhere [*Ba.* 1078, *IT* 1385] in similar contexts either because the identity of the deity is uncertain or to add a touch of mystery." Cf. also τινος in S. *OC* 1623-4.

[36] The stranger would not speak of 'rituals' in connection with himself, and ὄργια refers to secret rites in general, but most frequently to the rites of Dionysus (LSJ).

[37] Cf. also *Ba.* 707 and 764 (the spectators know from 62-3 that the Messenger's interpretation is right), and *HF* 1002-3, which is confirmed by 906-8. In the case of *Ph.* 1181 (Zeus kills Capaneus with his lightning), the Messenger's interpretation — which is shared by Thebans and Argives alike: 1187, 1189 — is backed up by tradition.

[38] For a discussion of Apollo's role in *Andr.*, see Kovacs 78-80. Note that Pohlenz 288 ("der Gott greift persönlich mit anspornenden Zuruf ein") follows without further ado the Messenger's interpretation.

Athena says only that Poseidon has *calmed* the waves (1444-5).[39] Finally, there is:

> ἀλλ' ἦν ἄπιστον· μυρίων γὰρ ἐκ χερῶν
> οὐδεὶς τὰ τῆς θεοῦ θύματ' εὐτύχει βαλών.

> But it was unbelievable: for from countless hands nobody manages to hit the goddess's victims.
>
> (*IT* 328-9)

The phrasing, in particular τὰ τῆς θεοῦ θύματ', suggests that the Messenger understands that Artemis is protecting the two strangers, in order for them to be properly sacrificed afterwards.[40] The spectators will have known that, if it was Artemis who protected the strangers, her motives for doing so were different.[41] But most probably they will have thought not of Artemis, but rather of Apollo, who sent Orestes on this mission.[42] Or was it perhaps Athena, who had an interest in seeing the statue of Artemis come to Attica (cf. 1441)? Our understanding remains restricted.

This analysis of the presentation of divine interventions by the Euripidean messenger — a presentation which is based on a restricted understanding, and hence may be incorrect or at least speculative — makes it clear that messenger-speeches are not so simple or straightforward as they are often thought to be.

Temporary and permanent restriction of understanding

In most cases the messenger's restriction of understanding is of a temporary nature; as events proceed he gradually comes to understand how the matter really stands. Thus the Messenger of *Hipp.* learns in 1205-7 that the rumbling of the earth came from the sea, while in 1241 he learns of Theseus' curse; the Messenger of *HF* soon knows that his

[39] For Poseidon's pro-Trojan attitude in 1414-5 — as opposed to his pro-Greek attitude in the
Iliad —, see Lee ad *Tro.* 7.

[40] Cf. Weil ad 329.

[41] Cf. England ad 329.

[42] Cf. Wecklein ad 328f.

master is not joking, but has indeed gone mad. Note, however, that to the end he remains unaware of the divine source of Heracles' madness.[43] There are, however, two cases where the restricted knowledge of the messenger — concerning certain details of his story — is permanent. The first case pertains to *IT* (1). Here the Messenger reports to Iphigeneia the capture of two strangers, which the spectators, after 67-122, know to be Orestes and Pylades. When she asks him for their names (248), he can give her only one, that of Pylades (249), for this name he had heard the other stranger use (cf. 285 and 321). In the ensuing narrative he consistently refers to the two as 'the young men', 'the strangers', etc.[44] As a result of this restricted knowledge, Iphigeneia will almost sacrifice her own brother. In other words, the restriction of first-person narration is exploited here with great theatrical effect by Euripides.

The second case concerns *Or.* (2). At the end of his story the Messenger is not able to say how Helen disappeared:

> ἃ δ'
> ἐκ θαλάμων
> ἐγένετο διαπρὸ δωμάτων
> ἄφαντος, ...
> ἤτοι φαρμάκοισιν ἢ
> μάγων τέχναις ἢ θεῶν κλοπαῖς.

> but she from the chambers had vanished out through the house, ..., either by magic drugs or sorcerer's arts or gods' deceits.
> (*Or.* 1493-8, transl. M.L. West)

Thus this messenger-speech, by exception, is open-ended:[45] both characters and spectators have to wait until 1629-34 to learn from Apollo what really happened to Helen (the Phrygian's third supposition, gods'

[43] The Messenger's silence on Lyssa etc. does not indicate, as Pohlenz 299 claims, that Heracles' madness is not "das Werk einer eifersüchtigen Göttin", but "aus dem eigenen Innern des Menschen hinaussteigt".

[44] δισσοὺς ... νεανίας (264), ἄτερος ... (τοῖν) ξένοιν (281, 310), ξένους (304). ὁ ξένος (307, 315).

[45] The only other messenger-speech with an open end is *IT* (2). A special case is *Ph.* (1), where the Messenger through his repeated use of ἐς τόδ' ἡμέρας (1085) and ἐς τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν (1197) suggests that his story has not yet finished.

deceits, will turn out to be the correct one). Once more, the restriction of understanding is exploited: the spectators, who had first been led to believe that Helen was killed,[46] are now still uncertain about her fate, although they do know that she is not dead.[47]

Following these examples of adherence to the restrictions of first-person narration in the Euripidean messenger-speech, I now turn to cases where these restrictions are evaded, violated or played with.

1.3 Getting round the restrictions

It is no easy task for an author to consistently carry through the restrictions of first-person narration,[48] nor would this necessarily be a desirable goal, since chances are high that the result would be less than interesting. From the very beginning, authors, including Euripides, have searched for ways to escape from the straightjacket of first-person narration.

Getting round the restriction of place

To get round the restriction of place, a first-person narrator may rely on hearsay. Thus Odysseus is able to recount the conversation between Zeus and Helios (*Odyssey* 12.374-88) because it was told to him by Calypso, who in turn had heard about it from Hermes (389-90). We have already (pp. 10-11 above) encountered a similar example of hearsay in a messenger-speech: *Heracl.* 847-63. Here Euripides has taken care to account for the Messenger's knowledge of events at which he had not been present. But according to Dodds, in the following passage Euripides has simply ignored the restriction of place:

[46] See p. 23.

[47] The situation is somewhat different in S. *OC* 1656-65; here the Messenger knows that Oedipus is dead, but he cannot describe how he died, because Oedipus had ordered him to stand aside (1640-4). Nor does Theseus, who alone had remained with Oedipus (1644), give an account when he returns on stage in 1751.

[48] For the difficulties involved, see Hägg 127-37 (on *Leucippe and Clitophon*), Stanzel 1982: 115-117, and Van der Paardt 77-9 on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

πάλιν δ' ἐχώρουν ὅθεν ἐκίνησαν πόδα,
κρήνας ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἃς ἀνῆκ' αὐταῖς θεός.
νίψαντο δ' αἷμα, σταγόνα δ' ἐκ παρηίδων
γλώσσῃ δράκοντες ἐξεφαίδρυνον χροός.

Back they went to the place they had started from, to the very springs the god sent up for them; they washed off the blood, while the drops from their cheeks the snakes cleansed from their skin with their tongues.
(*Ba.* 765-8, transl. G.S. Kirk)

"The Herdsman is allowed to round off his narrative by describing what he cannot well have seen. This is not unusual, and does not authorize us to regard him as a liar. To do that is to apply standards of the modern detective story to a wholly different art form." Dodds does not say *why* the Messenger "cannot well have seen" this scene, but the answer is provided by Roux 486, ad 765-8: "Le retour à la montagne. Le berger, *qui a fui*, n'a pu en être le temoin" (my italics). Apparently both she and Dodds are thinking of 763-4 (ἀπενώτιζον φυγῇ γυναῖκες ἄνδρας). But here those who are fleeing are the inhabitants of the villages of Hysiae and Erythrae, on which the Maenads had launched their attack in 751. The problem, if there is one, lies in 734, for here the herdsmen are fleeing from the Maenadic attack, which the Messenger himself had elicited in 728-30. But I do not see this as a problem, since the herdsmen, having escaped from the danger of a *sparagmos* (734-5), would quite naturally have hidden themselves (for the second time, cf. 722-3) and watched the events from a safe place until the end.[49] After all, it is their cattle (and later their neighbours) being attacked. There are, in fact, clear indications that they continued to watch: ἂν προσεῖδες (737), εἶδες ἂν (740), and τὸ δεινὸν ... θέαμ' ἰδεῖν (760).

The situation is slightly different in *Andr.*: from 1111 onwards the Messenger recounts what happened inside the Apollo-temple, although it appears from 1156-60 that he (and the other servants of Neoptolemus)

[49] As appears from his remark ad 751-2 ("the Herdsmen would pass them [the two villages] in their flight towards Thebes"), Dodds thinks that the flight of the herdsmen continues after 734-5 and, hence, that χωροῦσι in 748 means a *persecution* by the Maenads of the fleeing herdsmen. In my opinion, however, it is the Maenads who lead, and the herdsmen who follow (at a safe distance). Note that in 1139ff. too, Agave moves towards Thebes after the *sparagmos*.

had remained outside. Here, indeed, the necessity of the messenger giving a full and detailed eyewitness account seems to have prevailed over strict realism.[50] But this breach of realism probably passed unnoticed, since, as we have seen (p. 5), messengers tend to fade into the background after the opening lines of their story. Either they become more or less invisible, watching without being noticed themselves (as in *Ba.*(1)),[51] or their existence is simply forgotten by the spectators (as here).

Sometimes the invisibility of the messenger becomes conspicuous. Thus in the messenger-speech in *El.*, the Messenger tells how he accompanied Orestes and Pylades (774-5), and then followed them into Aegisthus' house (790). But at the crucial moment, when Aegisthus' retainers are about to attack Orestes and Pylades, we hear:

> δμῶες δ' ἰδόντες εὐθὺς ᾖξαν ἐς δόρυ,
> πολλοὶ μάχεσθαι <u>πρὸς δύ'</u>
>
> The servants [sc. of Aegisthus], seeing, straightway rushed for their spears,
> many for a fight <u>against two</u>
>
> (*El.* 844-5, transl. M.J. Cropp)

Where is the Messenger now, when his master most needs him?

Euripides would not be Euripides, did he not at some time make explicit this whole question of the invisible presence of the messenger.[52] The place is *Or.* (2), which for this very purpose is given an exceptional, interrupted structure. The Phrygian Messenger tells how Orestes and Pylades approached Helen in tears and how her Phrygian servants ran away, asking themselves whether this was a plot. At this point the chorus-leader interrupts the Messenger's story to ask:[53]

[50] Stevens 226, ad 1100-1157 mentions "the conventional licence of the narrator to report what he in fact could not have observed", and gives as other instances *Ba.* 686-8 and 765-8, and *Or.* 1404ff.

[51] Cf. Friedman 1175: "Because of his subordinate role in the story itself, the witness-narrator has much greater mobility ... than the protagonist proper."

[52] For Euripides' habit of making explicit, sometimes ridiculing the theatrical conventions of his day, see Winnington-Ingram 1969.

[53] The question seems to have been triggered by the Messenger's use of <u>third</u>-person (ἔθορον ἔθορον (1416), προσεῖπε (1418)) instead of first-person predicates.

σὺ δ' ἦσθα ποῦ τότ'; ἢ πάλαι φεύγεις φόβῳ,

And where were you at that point? Or had you long since fled in panic,
(*Or.* 1425, transl. M.L. West)[54]

'I was there', the Messenger retorts, 'fanning my mistress'; and he continues his story. Orestes led Helen away and Pylades shut up the Phrygian servants in different rooms, 'away from their mistress' (ἀποπρὸ δεσποίνας: 1451). Now the chorus-leader might well have asked *how* the Messenger, who from this moment on is no longer near his mistress, is able to recount what happened to her. Instead she asks:

τί τοὐπὶ τῷδε συμφορᾶς ἐγίγνετο;

What was the next phase of the episode?
(*Or.* 1452, transl. M.L. West)

And without hesitation, modification or explanation the Messenger continues to report what happened, even stressing the fact that he was an eyewitness (ἔδρακον, ἔδρακον: 1456). Then, at the climactic moment when Orestes is about to cut Helen's throat, the chorus-leader asks what we would have liked to ask the Messenger of *El.* too:

ποῦ δ' ἦτ' ἀμύνειν οἱ κατὰ στέγας Φρύγες;

and where were you to defend her, you Phrygian domestics?
(*Or.* 1473, transl. M.L. West)

The Messenger relates how the Phrygians cracked the doorposts of the rooms in which they were locked and came to rescue her, only to run away again at the sight of Pylades. We see how Euripides has used the image of the frightened barbarian to play with a convention (the invisible and passive presence of the messenger) which is also implicitly at work in other messenger-speeches. But Euripides is not merely playing here. This explicit violation of the restriction of place has a clear function: the σαφήνεια of the Messenger's account of the attack on

[54] Cf. Willink *ad loc.*: "A hit at the narrator's timidity, but also playing characteristically with the convention that messengers may go beyond the limits of strict autopsy."

Helen is undermined. In other words, the technique contributes to the *suggestio falsi* which is upheld in the finale of the play, i.e. the suggestion that Helen is being killed.[55]

A passage which is often seen as another instance of violation of the restriction of place is:

σωφρόνως, οὐχ ὡς σὺ φῇς
ᾠνωμένας κρατῆρι καὶ λωτοῦ ψόφῳ
θηρᾶν καθ' ὕλην Κύπριν ἠρημωμένας.

(the Maenads were asleep) decently — it is not as you say that, drunken from the mixing bowl and the skirl of the flute they hunt in the woods for the Cyprian's pleasure, going off one by one.

(*Ba*. 686-8, transl. G.S. Kirk)

Dodds' commentary runs as follows: "ὡς σὺ φῇς: 221ff. The Herdsman was not present at that conversation, but as Aristarchus says of Homer ὃ ᾔδει ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦτο τῷ προσώπῳ περιέθηκεν." Strictly speaking the situation here is different from that in the examples discussed earlier, since we are dealing not with the disputed autopsy of the Messenger of an event which forms part of his *own* story, but of an event presented *on stage*. However, on account of the present form φῇς instead of ἔφης (and cf. ψέγεις in 712) I would suggest that the Messenger in 686 is not referring to 221ff.,[56] but is speaking in a *general* way about Pentheus' opinion of Maenadism. His opinion was undoubtedly voiced on many occasions, and was therefore public knowledge; Dionysus also knows of it: 45-6.[57] When in his concluding evaluation this Messenger uses the same words (τὸν δαίμον' ... τόνδ' ὅστις ἔστ': 769) as Pentheus did in 220 (Διόνυσον, ὅστις ἔστι), this should not be considered a quotation

[55] See Arnott 1973: 56-9 and Willink xxxvii-iii.

[56] Note also that in 221ff. Pentheus is in fact — assentingly — quoting others (cf. 216: κλύω and 233: λέγουσι).

[57] A better example of a messenger's conventional knowledge is *Or*. 915-6, where the farmer-Messenger suddenly knows about Tyndareus' having provided arguments to one of the speakers. Cf. Willink *ad loc.*: "we do not ask how the narrator knows about Tynd.'s role; someone could have told him, but for the 'messenger-speech convention'".

by the Messenger, but a signal sent out by Euripides and intended for the spectators.[58]

Drawing up the balance, we see that the restriction of place is ignored in the first half of the messenger-speech in *Heracl.*, adhered to in the (miraculous) second half; violated implicitly in the messenger-speech in *Andr.*, and explicitly in *Or.* (2). The two instances from *Ba.* (1), which are usually mentioned as instances of violation, are open to other interpretations.

Getting round the restriction of access

A common method of getting round the restriction of access is to "draw inferences as to how others are feeling or what they are feeling" (Friedman 1174). Friedman gives an example from *The Great Gatsby*: "Thus Nick Carraway speculates, after Gatsby's solitary death, about what went on in his mind before he was shot: "No telephone message arrived ... *I have an idea* that Gatsby himself didn't believe it would come, and *perhaps* he no longer cared.""[59] A comparable example from a Euripidean messenger-speech is:

> καί τις γεραιὰ προσπόλων, δόξασά <u>που</u>
> ἢ Πανὸς ὀργὰς ἤ τινος θεῶν μολεῖν,
> ἀνωλόλυξε
>
> and an old maid, <u>presumably</u> thinking that the anger of Pan or another god had come [upon Creon's daughter], started to cry aloud
>
> (*Med.* 1171-3)

The Messenger infers what the old maid thought (δόξασα), at the moment when Creon's daughter suddenly changed colour and fell down on her throne (1168-70). This is in fact the only place where a messenger explicitly marks his inference as an inference through the use of

[58] Roux' comment ad 769-774 is ambiguous: "Penthée avait employé la même expression avec dedain ... Elle est reprise ici *à dessein*, dans un tout autre sens" (my italics). But "à dessein" by whom?

[59] In this context Van der Paardt 77 draws attention to the frequent use of *scilicet* in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

που.[60] Elsewhere he simply presents other characters' perceptions (e.g. *Heracl.* 843-4: ὁ πρέσβυς Ὕλλον ἐξορμώμενον ἰδών),[61] thoughts (e.g. *Ph.* 1238-9: ἐπερρόθησαν ... ὡς δίκαι' ἡγούμενοι),[62] and intentions (e.g. *Andr.* 1111-3: ἔρχεται ... κρηπῖδος ἐντός, ὡς ... εὔξαιτο).[63] In narratological terms, what happens is that the messenger, who is himself the primary focalizer, embeds the focalization of another character into his text. Such secondary or embedded focalization is normal in stories presented by an omniscient narrator, as, for example, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[64] One of the characteristics of omniscient narration is precisely this ability to look into other characters' hearts. The messenger's ability to read other people's minds is not in itself unrealistic: he sees what is happening and can infer from another character's words and actions how he or she views the event taking place. The following examples will make this clear.
First example:

ὡς δ' εἶδ' Ἄδραστος Ζῆνα πολέμιον στρατῷ,
ἔξω τάφρου καθῖσεν Ἀργείων στρατόν.
οἱ δ' αὖ παρ' ἡμῶν δεξιὸν Διὸς τέρας
ἰδόντες ἐξήλαυνον

When Adrastus saw that Zeus was hostile to his army, he halted the Argive army beyond the ditch. Our men, observing the favourable omen from Zeus charged out

(*Ph.* 1187-90, transl. E.J. Craik)

[60] Cf. *Heracl.* 395-7 (in a speech in which Demodocus gives an eyewitness report): σκοπεῖ [Eurystheus] (δόκησιν δὴ τόδ' ἂν λέγοιμι σοι) ποίᾳ προσάξει ...

[61] Other examples: *Med.* 1173-5 (ὁρᾷ); *Heracl.* 819-20 (ἔγνωσαν); *Supp.* 680-1 (ἰδών), 694-5 (ὑπείδετο); *IT* 301-2 (ὁρᾷ); *Ph.* 1163 (ἐσεῖδεν).

[62] Other examples: *HF* 967-9, 970-1, 985 (δοκῶν), 998-1000 (ὡς ... ὤν); *IT* 299 (δοκῶν); *Ba.* 1113 (ἐμάνθανεν). The instances from *HF* will be discussed in Ch. 3, pp. 165-71.

[63] Other examples: *Supp.* 696 (πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ... δυσθυμίαν); *Ion* 1126-7 (ὡς ... δεύσειε); *Ph.* 1097-8 (ὡς ... εἴη), 1383 (ὅπως ... ἐξολισθάνοι); *Ba.* 1116-7 (ὡς ... μή κτάνοι).

[64] See De Jong 1987a: 101-48. I note in passing that a historian, though he does not present his material through a first-person narrator, faces the same problem of restricted access (he cannot know what went on in the minds of historical persons) and must resort to similar means of getting round this restriction: see for Thucydides Schneider 39-68, for Herodotus Lang 73-9.

In 1172-86 the Messenger described how Capaneus was struck dead by Zeus' lightning while climbing the ladder. He can infer from their reactions, how Adrastus and the Thebans see this same event: Adrastus, who is drawing his troops back, interprets it negatively (Ζῆνα πολέμιον στρατῷ), while the Thebans, who are advancing, interpret it positively (δεξιὸν Διὸς τέρας).
Second example:

> ἔγνω κλύδωνα πολεμίων προσκείμενον
> καὶ τὴν παροῦσαν συμφορὰν αὐτοῖν πέλας
> ᾤμωξέ θ'
>
> he [the stranger=Orestes] saw the onsurging wave of enemies and understood that the present calamity was close upon them and gave a groan
> (*IT* 316-8)

The attack by the herdsmen, among them the Messenger, had begun in 309-10 (πᾶς ἀνὴρ εἶχεν πόνον βάλλων ἀράσσων), and the Messenger can infer what is going on in the stranger's head ('he understood that the present calamity was close upon them') from his reaction in 318 (ᾤμωξε) and, more particularly, from his words in 321 (Πυλάδη, θανούμεθ').[65] The Messenger is in 316-7 embedding the stranger's focalization; this is shown not only by ἔγνω, but also by the fact that he refers to himself and his fellow-herdsmen as πολεμίων, which is how the stranger sees them. When in 323 the Messenger himself is focalizing again (εἴδομεν), it is the strangers who are referred to as the enemies (πολεμίων).
Third example:

> Πενθεὺς δ' ὁ τλήμων θῆλυν οὐχ ὁρῶν ὄχλον
> ἔλεξε τοιάδ'· Ὦ ξέν', οὗ μὲν ἕσταμεν,
> οὐκ ἐξικνοῦμαι μαινάδων ὄσσοις νόθων

[65] The pleonasm τὴν παροῦσαν συμφορὰν ... πέλας seems to suggest that τὴν παροῦσαν συμφοράν refers to the Taurian custom of human sacrifice. The Messenger's colleague had already suggested in 277-8 that the strangers were aware of this custom. From 75 the spectators know that Orestes and Pylades do indeed know of it.

> But the wretched Pentheus, since he could not see the throng of women, spoke these words: "Stranger, where we stand my vision does not reach the spurious maenads"
>
> (*Ba.* 1058-60, transl. G.S. Kirk)

Here the focalization of Pentheus, which the Messenger can easily infer from the latter's words, differs from that of the Messenger himself, who can see the Maenads (cf. 1052-7). The fact that Pentheus cannot see the women is a another sign of his delusion, which had also become apparent onstage in 918-22.

Fourth example:

> ὁ δ', ὡς κρατῶν δὴ καὶ νενικηκὼς μάχῃ,
> ξίφος δικὼν ἐς γαῖαν ἐσκύλευέ νιν
>
> Eteocles, of course supposing himself victor and winner in the fight, cast sword to the ground and plundered him [Polyneices]
>
> (*Ph.* 1416-7, transl. E. Craik)

The Messenger infers from Eteocles' behaviour that the latter considers his brother — who has fallen to the ground (1415) — defeated and himself the victor. Eteocles' assessment of the situation will soon prove to be wrong: Polyneices is not yet defeated and with his failing strength succeeds in killing his brother (1419-22). Note how the Messenger dissociates himself from Eteocles' assessment by adding ὡς ... δή to the participles.[66] The embedded focalization lays bare Eteocles' hasty self-assuredness, which enhances the negative portrayal of this character in *Ph.*

In the examples discussed so far, we could observe a narrative technique which is also found in the *Iliad.*[67] An event is presented first by the primary narrator-focalizer and then by a secondary focalizer: event X took place ... When character A saw event X ... Sometimes the first presentation is left out and we are confronted directly with the secondary focalization, e.g.:

[66] In other words, Eteocles' opinion rests on false assumptions. See for this use of ὡς ('supposing/thinking that') + participle Rijksbaron 1976b: 152-4, example 29. For (ironic) δή + participle, see Denniston 1954: 230, ii, who mentions this passage.

[67] See De Jong 1987a: 105-7.

ἱερὰ δ' ἐς χεῖρας λαβὼν
Αἴγισθος ἤθρει. καὶ λοβὸς μὲν οὐ προσῆν
σπλάγχνοις, πύλαι δὲ καὶ δοχαὶ χολῆς πέλας
κακὰς ἔφαινον τῷ σκοποῦντι προσβολάς.

Aegisthus took the sacred parts in his hands, and looked. On the liver there was no lobe, and the portal vein and gall-bladder showed onsets of harm to the observer close at hand.

(*El.* 826-9, transl. M.J. Cropp)

Aegisthus is the secondary focalizer of this passage (note ἤθρει, ἔφαινον, τῷ σκοποῦντι), and while the Messenger will also have seen what Aegisthus saw, the report of events as seen through the eyes of the person most involved, i.e. the one for whom the ominous signs are 'meant', is surely more effective than the usual procedure of double presentation.[68]

Although he does not designate them as such, the messenger's inferences are inferences and not facts. This is something to keep in mind in a passage such as:

ἡ δὲ καὶ θνῄσκουσ' ὅμως
πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμων πεσεῖν,
κρύπτουσ' ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ' ἀρσένων χρεών.

And she [Polyxena] even when dying did her best to fall down gracefully, concealing what should be concealed from men's eyes.

(*Hec.* 568-70)

While it may be true that Polyxena did her best to fall down gracefully, — this at least was visible — the motive which Talthybius ascribes to her (modesty) seems to be based on *his* preoccupations rather than hers. She had just then bared her breasts[69] and her concern was not to die as a modest maiden, but to die as a free woman.

My conclusion is that the restriction of access is not seldom evaded in the Euripidean messenger-speech. This indicates that the messenger, like the narrator of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, aims to give what Genette calls

[68] Another example is *Med.* 1173-5, where the new symptoms of the princess's illness are described directly through the eyes of the old servant (ὁρᾷ).

[69] For the significance of this gesture, see pp. 142-3.

a "récit motivé", i.e. a story in which what characters do is continually motivated: A did X, because/seeing that/in order to ...[70] The messenger's inferences about what other characters see, think, and intend, are in general fairly reliable, in that the messenger can go by what he himself sees, and by the other character's actions and/or words. The example of Talthybius, however, teaches us that a messenger's inference cannot always be taken at face value: he may unintentionally pass off his own feelings as those of the characters' whose minds he is attempting to read.

Getting round the restriction of understanding

The restriction of understanding — and, for that matter, those of place and access — can be counterbalanced by *ex eventu* knowledge. An example from Odysseus' *Apologoi*, which is discussed by Suerbaum 156, is *Od.* 9.116-41: Odysseus describes the goat island at the very moment he is recounting their arrival there on a moonless night. In fact, Odysseus does not explore the island until the next morning (152ff.). According to Suerbaum 163, Odysseus makes such frequent use of his *ex eventu* knowledge that in this respect his presentation does not differ significantly from that of the omniscient narrator of the *Odyssey*.[71]

A similar example from a Euripidean messenger-speech is to be found in *Andr.* 1088-99. While Neoptolemus and his servants spend three days sight-seeing in Delphi, Orestes sets the Delphians against Neoptolemus and they post guards in the Apollo temple. The Messenger cannot have found out about this until later, after the murder of Neoptolemus has taken place; and, indeed, he stresses how they (Neoptolemus and his servants) came to the temple 'not yet having learnt anything about these things' (οὐδὲν τῶνδέ πω πεπυσμένοι: 1101).

According to Erdmann 179, the Euripidean messenger, like Odysseus, regularly uses his *ex eventu* knowledge: "Der Bote erzählt das Geschehen chronologisch geordnet in der Reihenfolge, wie er es erlebt hat,

[70] See De Jong 1987a: 91-3.

[71] I have argued in De Jong 1985: 15-6 that Achilles' omniscience in *Il.* 1.372, 378, 380-1 (in the report he gives his mother of the quarrel with Agamemnon) can be explained by the fact that he is narrating in retrospect.

interpretiert es jedoch — zu besserem Verständnis — *ex eventu*."[72] This statement is a generalization, which certainly does not apply to all messenger-speeches. In fact, Erdmann gives only examples from *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2), messenger-speeches which will prove to be exceptional cases.[73] This matter merits a closer investigation.

1.4 Experiencing versus narrating focalization

In discussing first-person narratives, narratologists distinguish between the *narrating* 'I' ("erzählendes Ich") and the *experiencing* 'I' ("erlebendes Ich").[74] Thus in *Great Expectations* we have the young Pip who undergoes the events, and the mature Pip who recounts them, e.g.: "I tell this lightly, but it was no light thing to me". The difference between the narrating 'I' and the experiencing 'I' is one of focalization: the first-person narrator can tell how he focalizes an event *now* and how he focalized it *then*. In the above quotation from *Great Expectations* we have a juxtaposition of the two focalizations: that of the moment of narration ("lightly") and that of the moment of experiencing ("no light thing").

A passage from a Euripidean messenger-speech which nicely illustrates the distinction between experiencing focalization and narrating focalization is:

> διπλᾶ με χρῄζεις δάκρυα κερδᾶναι, γύναι,
> σῆς παιδὸς οἴκτῳ· νῦν τε γὰρ λέγων κακὰ
> τέγξω τόδ' ὄμμα πρὸς τάφῳ θ' ὅτ' ὤλλυτο.

[72] Kannicht 397-8, ad *Hel.* 1512-1692 expresses the same view — note that he is referring to the messenger-speech in general —: "Auf die Erzählweise des Berichts wirkt sich diese Antizipation in der Weise aus, daß der Bote den Ereignisablauf nicht bloß chronologisch genau so nacherzählt, wie er ihn als Augenzeuge miterlebt hat, ..., sondern so, wie er sich ihm von seinem aufgedeckten Ziel her darstellt, also zwar auch chronologisch genau, aber zugleich auch schon implizit oder explizit die Zusammenhänge interpretierend."

[73] In like manner, Kannicht (previous note) seems to base his general observation on the exceptional case of *Hel.* (2).

[74] This distinction was made for the first time by L. Spitzer in his *Stilstudien II*, München 1928, 447-9. (See also Lintvelt 79-80, n. 3.) It is, of course, only relevant in the case of *posterior* narration, i.e. narration after the events have taken place (Genette 228-34).

> you ask me to shed double tears, woman, out of pity for your daughter: for now, telling of her misery, I will wet my face just as I did at her grave when she died.
>
> (*Hec.* 518-20)

Note that Talthybius distinguishes between 'now' and 'then' only to indicate that he still views Polyxena's sacrifice in the same way.

Whereas in *Great Expectations* many years separate the narrating Pip from the experiencing Pip, in Euripidean messenger-speeches the distance in time is only a matter of hours.[75] The messenger tells his story 'hot from the press':

> κἀγὼ μὲν εὐθὺς πρὸς σὲ δεῦρ' ἀπεστάλην,
> σοὶ τὰς ἐκεῖθεν σημανῶν, ἄναξ, τύχας.
>
> and I have immediately come here to you, to tell you what took place there.
>
> (*IT* 1409-10)[76]

In principle a first-person narrator may choose to narrate according to his experiencing focalization or to his narrating focalization. In other words, he may choose whether or not to make use of his *ex eventu* knowledge, and to anticipate future events ("little could I suspect then that later ..."). Thus, as we have seen, Odysseus narrates mainly according to his narrating focalization, whereas in *Great Expectations* the dominant focalization is that of the young, experiencing Pip. The reader shares Pip's limited understanding of what is happening to him. As a result, throughout the greater part of the book we do not know who Pip's secret benefactor is, and when this turns out to be the convict Magwitch rather than Miss Havisham (as Pip had surmised), we are as astounded as he is. In the case of the Euripidean messenger-speech, the situation is somewhat more complicated.

[75] In A. *Pers.* and *A.* somewhat more time elapses (several days).

[76] Cf. ἀρτίως in *Med.* 1125; the hurried entrance of the Messengers in *Med.* 1119 (πνεῦμα ... ἠρεθισμένον) and *Hipp.* 1152 (σπουδῇ); and *Hel.* 1616-7 (ἐς δὲ γαῖαν ἐξέβησέ σοι τάδ' ἀγγελοῦντα).

How versus what

The outcome of events is made known to the spectators in advance; as soon as the messenger enters the stage, he blurts out the main news, the κεφάλαια of the story to follow, e.g.:

> ὄλωλεν ἡ τύραννος ἀρτίως κόρη
> Κρέων θ' ὁ φύσας φαρμάκων τῶν σῶν ὕπο.
>
> The king's daughter has just died and her father Kreon, through your poison.
> (*Med.* 1125-6)

or

> νικῶμεν ἐχθροὺς καὶ τροπαῖ' ἱδρύεται
> παντευχίαν ἔχοντα πολεμίων σέθεν.
>
> We have defeated the enemy and trophies are being raised containing the panoplies of your enemies.
> (*Heracl.* 786-7)[77]

The only exception to the rule by which the main news is announced in the introductory dialogue is *Or.* (2). Here the Messenger does not mention that Helen has not died, but has disappeared; rather he laments the fall of Troy (1381-92). Breaking the rule here, of course, again helps to create the *suggestio falsi* that Helen is dead (above p. 23).[78]

Thus, with the (effective) exception of *Or.* (2), the messenger adheres to a narrative principle which Van Groningen 58 considers typical of archaic and classical Greek literature:

> Il y a lieu de croire que l'esprit hellénique préférait savoir d'avance où on allait le conduire. Plutôt que d'être tenu en suspens par un dénouement tenu secret, il préférait apprendre comment un résultat déjà connu avait été atteint.[79]

[77] The same technique is used by Aeschylus (*Pers.* 255, *Th.* 375-6, *A.* 522-31) and Sophocles (*Aj.* 720-1, *Ant.* 384-5, *Tr.* 739-40, 874-5, *OT* 1235, *El.* 673, *OC* 1580).

[78] In the case of *IT* (2) the news is only *partially* revealed (we hear that Iphigeneia and Orestes have escaped, but not that a sudden storm threatens to thwart their escape).

[79] Cf. also Van Otterlo 43.

As a result, the suspense of the messenger-speech differs from that of first-person narratives such as *Great Expectations* or the Sherlock Holmes stories. It is not concerned with the questions *what* or *who*, but *how*:

> Der nächste Schritt ist dann, daß sie ... lapidar und schlagzeilenartig zusammenfassen, was sich dem Ergebnis und den Konsequenzen nach ereignet hat; dadurch wird in dem Adressaten (und im Zuschauer) die elementare Spannung auf das *Was* gelöst und in eine differenzierte Spannung auf das *Wie* des Ereignisverlaufs verwandelt, und diese verwandelte Spannung wiederum ist die Exposition des eigentlichen Berichts.[80]

Indeed, many a messenger-speech is triggered by a 'how' (πῶς) question from one of the messenger's internal addressees: e.g. πῶς ὤλοντο; (*Med.* 1134) or πῶς καὶ διώλετ'; (*Hipp.* 1171).[81]

Additional suspense is created for the spectators in scenes where the messenger tells his story leisurely, while in fact immediate action is called for. Thus, although the Messenger of *Med.* suggests that Medea had better flee immediately (1122-3),[82] he goes on to deliver a long narrative.[83] Scholars have critized the use of these long narratives in such urgent situations, but Euripides has taken care to motivate their length, in the case of *Med.*, for example, by having Medea herself ask the Messenger to tell his story at length: ἀλλὰ μὴ σπέρχου, φίλος, λέξον δέ (1133-4).[84]

[80] Kannicht 169.

[81] And cf. *Andr.* 1083, *Hec.* 515, *Supp.* 647-8, *El.* 772-3, *HF* 917-8, *IT* 256-7, *Ion* 1119, *Hel.* 1523, *Ph.* 1086-7, 1354-5. Cf. also A. *Pers.* 446; S. *Aj.* 747, *Tr.* 884-6, 878, 879-80, 890, *OC* 1585.

[82] And cf. *IT* 1323-4, *Ion* 1106-8, *Ph.* 1259-63.

[83] The average length of Euripidean messenger-speeches is 80 verses. In antiquity Euripides was famous for the length of his messenger-speeches. Cf. the sch. on Ar. *Ach.* 416a (ed. N.G. Wilson): ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς προλόγους μακρηγοροῦντες εἰσάγει Εὐριπίδης, πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος ἀποτείνεται.

[84] In the case of *IT* (2), it is the Messenger himself who advises Thoas to listen to his story first (1322-4); Thoas eagerly accepts, as he is sure that the fugitives will not escape (1325-6). In *Ion* the chorus urges the Messenger to tell them his story before continuing his search for Creusa (1119-21). In *Ph.* (2) the Messenger at first tries to avoid telling the unpleasant part of his news, and only does so at Jocasta's urgent request (1207-18).

In answering the 'how' questions, the messenger goes back in time, beginning his narrative 'at the beginning'. This is either an event mentioned earlier in the play (when he opens with an ἐπεί-clause: 60%) or new information (when he opens with a declarative sentence: 40%).[85] An example of an opening with an ἐπεί-clause is:

ἐπεὶ μελάθρων τῶνδ' ἀπήραμεν πόδα

When we had started on our way from the dwelling here
(*El.* 774, transl. M.J. Cropp)

The Messenger is referring back to 620ff., where Orestes plans to set off towards Aegisthus, and more particularly to 669ff., where he takes his leave.
An example of an opening with a declarative sentence is:

ἡμεῖς μὲν ἀκτῆς κυμοδέγμονος πέλας
ψήκτραισιν ἵππων ἐκτενίζομεν τρίχας
κλαίοντες

We were combing our horses' hair near the wave-receiving shore, weeping
(*Hipp.* 1173-5)

The Messenger provides new information and he does not begin from the point where Hippolytus leaves the stage (1098-1101).

The messenger goes back in time not only chronologically but also mentally: he recounts the events very much as he experienced and understood them at the time they took place. In other words, in most Euripidean messenger-speeches the messenger renounces his *ex eventu* knowledge, the knowledge he had displayed in the introductory dialogue, and narrates according to his experiencing focalization.[86]

[85] See Rijksbaron 1976a.

[86] Though there are traces of this technique in the Sophoclean first-person messenger-speeches (e.g. *OT* 1251, *Ant.* 1206-10, 1209, *OC* 1656-65), it seems to have been fully developed by Euripides, for reasons which will be set out below (p. 38).

Experiencing focalization

The experiencing focalization of the Euripidean messenger can be most clearly illustrated by those messenger-speeches which recount the execution of an intrigue (*mechanema*).[87] In all these *mechanema* messenger-speeches except *El.*,[88] the messenger has no previous knowledge of the intrigue and only gradually grasps the true nature of things. His report mirrors this process of slowly dawning. By way of example I will look more closely at the messenger-speeches in *Med.* and *Ba.* (2).

In the introductory dialogue to the messenger-speech in *Med.* the Messenger says that Creon and his daughter died through Medea's poison (φαρμάκων τῶν σῶν ὕπο: 1126). However, when he goes to tell his story, he begins from scratch, as it were. First, he stresses both his own joy at the reconciliation of Jason and Medea (ἥσθημεν: 1138, ἡδονῆς ὕπο: 1142) and the princess's exhilaration over Medea's presents (προσγελῶσα: 1162, ὑπερχαίρουσα: 1165).[89] In 1168-73, when the princess's condition suddenly changes, he first records the old woman's *incorrect* interpretation of the situation (ἢ Πανὸς ὀργὰς ἤ τινος θεῶν μολεῖν: 1172).[90] Then the new symptoms observed in 1173-5 lead the old woman to the conclusion that something lamentable is going on (κωκυτόν: 1177), while in 1177-9 it dawns on all those present that a disaster (συμφοράν: 1179) is befalling the princess. In 1186-9 it becomes clear to the Messenger that the princess's plight is caused by Medea's gifts, the crown and robe (σῶν τέκνων δωρήματα: 1188).[91] In 1201 the Messenger's understanding is complete: it is poison, smeared on the crown and robe, which brings about the girl's demise (γνάθοις

[87] See Appendix A, pp. 180-1.

[88] For *El.*, see p. 37.

[89] The Messenger's use of the present tense in 1144 (δέσποινα [Creon's daughter] δ' ἣν νῦν ἀντὶ σοῦ θαυμάζομεν) seems to be yet another indication that he has mentally taken himself back into the past. This is not a historic present, and one possible parallel is *IT* 1329: ἡμᾶς μέν, οὓς σὺ δεσμὰ συμπέμπεις ξένων.

[90] Other examples of such incorrect interpretations: *IT* 267-78, 1340-1; *Or.* 875-6. Later authors will explore this technique of providing false clues even more intensively, e.g. Achilles Tatius in *Leucippe and Clitophon* 3.15, 5.7 (Suerbaum 157).

[91] Note also ἐπεστρατεύετο (1185), which suggests that the princess is the object of an attack by an enemy (Medea).

ἀδήλοις φαρμάκων).[92] Only now have we reached the point of the Messenger's initial statement again: ὄλωλεν ... φαρμάκων τῶν σῶν ὕπο (1126).[93]

In *Ba.* (2), the unknown factor is the identity of 'the stranger' and the nature of his intentions. In the first part of the story both the Messenger and Pentheus refer to Dionysus as 'the stranger' (Messenger: 1047, 1063, 1068; Pentheus: 1059). When in 1047 the Messenger calls the stranger πομπὸς ... θεωρίας these words have a double significance. The Messenger uses them in their neutral sense, in that the stranger is the guide of the mission which sets out to watch the spectacle of the Maenads; at this stage the Messenger has no misgivings about their mission. On the level of the external communication (between Euripides and the spectators), the words indicate a ritual procession, with Pentheus the victim about to be sacrificed.[94] In 1069 the Messenger begins to suspect that the stranger is perhaps no ordinary human being, since he performs 'no mortal things' (οὐχὶ θνητά). In 1075 (ὤφθη δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ κατεῖδε μαίναδας) the Messenger realizes that the tables are turned (cf. 1050: ὡς ὁρῷμεν οὐχ ὁρώμενοι), and that the stranger has manoeuvred his master into a position where he is an *object* rather than a *subject* of seeing. Then, in 1077-9, Dionysus' reverse metamorphosis (cf. 4: μορφὴν δ' ἀμείψας ἐκ θεοῦ βροτησίαν) takes place, and he becomes a god again: the Messenger observes that the stranger has disappeared and at the same time he hears a voice 'which seemed to be Dionysus'. The Messenger bases his cautious identification on the words spoken by the voice in 1079-81 (cf. pp. 15-6 above). These same words also reveal the deadly trap which Dionysus has set for Pentheus (ἄγω τὸν ... ἀλλὰ τιμωρεῖσθέ νιν). In 1089, when Dionysus has spoken for the second time, his identity is clear to Cadmus' daughters: ἐγνώρισαν

[92] Note the progression from πέπλοι ... ἔδαπτον σάρκα (1188-9) to σάρκες ... γνάθοις ἀδήλοις φαρμάκων ἀπέρρεον (1200-1).

[93] The Sophoclean messenger-speech *Tr.* 749-812 illustrates how a similar narrative of poisoning might be told omnisciently. Note especially 758 (τὸ σὸν ... δώρημα, θανάσιμον πέπλον), 763 (δείλαιος), and 773 (τὸν οὐδὲν αἴτιον τοῦ σοῦ κακοῦ).

[94] It is only on this level that the words are ironic (cf. Winnington-Ingram 1948: 128, n. 2, and Roux ad 1046-7), since the Messenger pities rather than critizes his master. For the idea of a ritual procession, see Seidensticker 183.

... σαφῆ κελευσμὸν Βακχίου. From now on the Messenger, too, speaks of θεοῦ (1094), Βακχίου (1124), ὁ θεός (1128). We see that here again the Messenger renounces his *ex eventu* knowledge — the chorus had confirmed in the introductory dialogue that the stranger was Dionysus (1031, 1033) — and tells his story according to his focalization as experiencing character.[95]

This same technique is employed in all other messenger-speeches, except those in *Andr.*, *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2). In some messenger-speeches, such as those in *Alc.* or *Hec.*, there is no question of a growing understanding, and the experiencing focalization is difficult to pinpoint. In *El.* the Messenger is a servant of Orestes, and as such is aware of the intrigue against Aegisthus. Hence no growing understanding here: rather the experiencing focalization manifests itself in the fact that the Messenger nowhere anticipates the successful outcome of Orestes' dangerous undertaking. Comparable in this respect are the messenger-speeches in *Heracl.*, *Supp.*, *Ph.* (1) and (3), which describe battles or a duel. Here the experiencing focalization of the messenger is reflected in the way he describes the progress of the fighting, giving no clues as to the outcome. This is illustrated by the following example:

> Πολυνείκης δ' ἀπήντησεν δορί,
> πληγὴν σιδήρῳ παραδοθεῖσαν εἰσιδών,
> κνήμην τε διεπέρασεν 'Αργεῖον δόρυ·
> στρατὸς δ' ἀνηλάλαξε Δαναϊδῶν ἅπας.
> κἀν τῷδε μόχθῳ γυμνὸν ὦμον εἰσιδὼν
> ὁ πρόσθε τρωθεὶς στέρνα Πολυνείκους βίᾳ
> διῆκε λόγχην, κἀπέδωκεν ἡδονὰς
> Κάδμου πολίταις

Polyneices aimed at it [Eteocles' leg] with his spear seeing the blow offered to the steel; and the Argive spear pierced the calf. All the army of the Danaids raised a cry. During this struggle, seeing a shoulder exposed, the one first wounded, thrust his shaft forcibly through Polyneices' chest and gave jubilation to the citizens of Cadmus.

(*Ph.* 1392-9, transl. E. Craik)

[95] Lacroix (on 1047) has failed to recognize this narrative technique: "Le messager comprend que ce qui s'est passé est l'oeuvre de Dionysos (cf. 1078-9), mais ne soupçonne pas l'identité réelle de l'étranger."

It may be enlightening at this point to compare A. *Pers*. 353-432, 447-71, where the Messenger does repeatedly announce the coming defeat of the Persians: 353-4: ἦρξεν μέν, ὦ δέσποινα, τοῦ παντὸς κακοῦ φανεὶς ἀλάστωρ ἢ κακὸς δαίμων ποθέν ('The one that started the whole disaster, lady, was some Curse or Evil Spirit which appeared from somewhere', transl. A.J. Podlecki), 361-2: οὐ ξυνεὶς δόλον Ἕλληνος ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲ τὸν θεῶν φθόνον ('not comprehending the treachery of the Greek, the jealousy of the gods'), 373: οὐ γὰρ τὸ μέλλον ἐκ θεῶν ἠπίστατο ('he did not know what was about to come from the gods'), 454: κακῶς τὸ μέλλον ἱστορῶν ('so false their knowledge of the outcome').

I conclude. Although Euripides, like Aeschylus and Sophocles, makes use of the introductory dialogue to announce briefly the outcome of the events to be narrated more fully afterwards, he has most of his messengers tell their story without making use of this *ex eventu* knowledge. The messenger's addressees are made to see the events exactly as he saw them, hence to share his experience of growing understanding, agitation and see-sawing emotions, from happiness to dismay, from joy to fear, from apprehension to exhilaration. The use of this technique of narrating according to one's experiencing focalization seems typical of Euripides, who aims to show in his plays the unexpected reversals and unpredictability of human life. It is also especially appropriate where secret plots are concerned, and may have been developed by Euripides especially for the many *mechanema* messenger-speeches he wrote.

In keeping with the Euripidean messenger's experiencing focalization is his use of *historic presents*.

Historic presents

Historic presents are a regular feature of the Euripidean messenger-speech;[96] in this respect they differ clearly from the Homeric epics,

[96] See Fischl 54-6, Erdmann 87-9. Their lists are incomplete, and an inventory is given in Appendix C. Cf. also Fränkel 650, ad *Ag*. 1303. Historic presents are also frequent in the Aeschylean and Sophoclean messenger-speeches and in later ones, e.g. those of Racine: Weinrich 125-6.

which have no historic presents at all.[97] Each Euripidean messenger-speech contains on average five historic presents;[98] in the messenger-speech in Med., for example, which has 104 verses, we find 22 imperfects, 19 aorists and 10 historic presents. Using a historic present means that a speaker "sich in die Zeit zurückversetzt wo die Handlung sich abspielte".[99] Generally speaking, when a historic present is alternated with imperfects and aorists, as is the case in the messenger-speech, its effect is one of vividness:

> if you introduce events in past time (τὰ παρεληλυθότα τοῖς χρόνοις) as happening at the present moment (ὡς γινόμενα καὶ παρόντα), the passage will be transformed from a narrative into a vivid actuality (ἐναγώνιον πρᾶγμα).[100]

In other words, in transporting himself to the past, the speaker makes his hearer into a kind of pseudo eyewitness.[101]

This effect of vividness, and the spectators' increased involvement can be exploited for specific purposes. According to Fischl 54-5, the Euripidean messenger turns to historic presents when he (1) recounts important events, or events which make a strong appeal to the senses (πίπτει, βοᾷ); (2) recounts his own actions and perceptions; and (3) introduces direct speeches. Linguists also suggest that historic presents highlight important or decisive actions.[102] The trouble here is that

[97] In point of fact, historic presents do not appear until Aeschylus and Herodotus: see Stahl 91.

[98] *Ph.* (2) has no historic presents, and *Heracl.* and *Hel.* (1) only one each; *HF*, on the other hand, has a total of 17 historic presents.

[99] Kühner-Gerth § 382,a,2.

[100] *On the Sublime* 25 (transl. Hamilton Fyfe, Loeb). Cf. Kühner-Gerth (see previous note) "bei besonderen Lebhaftigkeit"; Erdmann 88 "das vergangene Ereignis [gewinnt] in diesen Formen der Reportage die suggestive Kraft, als gegenwärtig zu erscheinen"; Collard 1975: 281, ad *Supp.* 653.

[101] Fischl 54 ("quo fit ut etiam audientis animo illa actio quasi praesens obversetur"). Cf. Heinze 374 on the use of historic presents in the *Aeneid* ("Das Bestreben den Hörer mit allen Mitteln an die Handlung heran, ja in sie hereinzuziehen"). Weinrich 38 calls the use of historic presents a characteristic of "spannend erzählenden Literatur", and cf. 125-6.

[102] Kühner-Gerth 132 ("zur Hervorhebung einzelner besonders bemerkenswerter und für die Folge wichtiger Momente") and Rijksbaron 1984: 22 ("highlights decisive actions").

historic presents are also used at less important moments and, conversely, in all three categories mentioned by Fischl we also find aorists and, to a lesser extent, imperfects.[103] Thus, in the case of *Med.* 1141 (servants kiss — κυνεῖ — the hands and heads of Medea's children), it would be difficult to maintain that this is a decisive event.[104] In the messenger-speech in *El.* it is not the blow dealt to Aegisthus (841: ἔπαισε) which is given a historic present, but the blow to the calf (838: κόπτει). Again, Heracles' forcing of the doors behind which his wife and one of his sons have barricaded themselves is expressed in historic presents (*HF* 999: σκάπτει, μοχλεύει), while their actual death is recounted by means of an aorist (1000: κατέστρωσεν). Similarly, the Messenger's own actions and perceptions are more often than not in imperfect or aorist: of the 24 first-person singular predicates concerned, 14 are aorists, 4 imperfects and 6 historic presents; of the 68 first-person plural predicates, 26 are aorists, 38 imperfects and 4 historic presents. Finally, if we consider the *verba dicendi* introducing direct speeches, we find 16 historic presents as against 8 imperfects and 47 aorists. In the messenger-speech in *Hec.*, for example, Polyxena's two speeches, which may be considered the emotional highlights of the story, are both introduced by aorists. I conclude that Fischl's analysis — with which Erdmann 88 concurs — is inadequate and I will take a fresh look at the material.

The first thing to note when surveying the corpus of historic presents in Euripidean messenger-speeches is that some verbs tend to recur regularly; the absolute leader is πίπτειν/πίτνειν and compounds (14 x),[105] followed by χωρεῖν (7 x),[106] and βοᾶν (7 x).[107] This can, of course, be explained in part by the particular subject matter of the messenger-speech (violent action). Idiosyncratic usage on the part of

[103] The same observation was made by Koller with regard to the Herodotean corpus of historic presents. Cf. also Svensson 92-102, who completely rejects the idea that historic presents convey vividness.

[104] Though the gesture has a momentum of its own, when we recall Medea's kissing her children (1069-75).

[105] As against seven imperfects (six plural predicates and one combination with a negation).

[106] As against four imperfects (two with inanimate subjects).

[107] As against three aorists.

Euripides may be a factor too, particularly where the poetic πίτνει (8 x) is involved.[108]

In a number of cases historic presents are used *alongside* past tenses, as in *Hec.* 574 (οἱ μὲν ... ἔβαλλον, οἱ δὲ πληροῦσιν), *El.* 821-2 (Πυλάδην μὲν εἷλετ'..., δμῶας δ' ἀπωθεῖ).[109] Here I doubt whether the intention went beyond simple variation (μετάβολη, *variatio*).[110] Variation is in itself not without effect, for as rhetorical theory teaches, it keeps the audience from becoming bored.[111]

There are, however, certain cases where a more pronounced effect seems intended, as the following analysis will show. In my opinion, the formulation of Fischl (and of Kühner-Gerth and Rijksbaron, see note 102) that historic presents highlight important or decisive actions is too short and should be amended to read: historic presents highlight actions *which are thereby marked (by the speaker) as* important or decisive.[112]

The messenger-speech in *Alc.* contains four historic presents, which all describe Alcestis' behaviour while in the bedroom: 176, 183, 184, 186. This is the only point in the play when her courage fails her and

[108] According to Koller 63-78, the use of historic presents is never stylistic (vividness), but is conditioned by the "Aktionsart" of the verb involved. In the case of certain verbs — and Koller's lists, based on Herodotus, contain ὁράω and πίπτω — the historic present takes over the function of the ingressive aorists of durative verbs, indicating the starting point of an action. As the discussion of Euripidean examples will show, this theory does not always hold true.

[109] Other examples: *Hipp.* 1220-1 (ἥρπασ'... ἕλκει δὲ); *Supp.* 704 (ἔκλινε)-6 (δ'... φεύγει); *IT* 330-1 (χειρούμεθα, ... δὲ ... ἐξεκόψαμεν); *Hel.* 1592 (ἀνεβόησε)-1596 (βοᾷ); *Ph.* 1169-70 (ἐξαθροίζεται ... δ' ἐπέστησ'), 1410-3 (ἀμφέρει ... δὲ ... καθῆκεν); *Or.* 887 (κἀπὶ τῷδ' ἀνίσταται)-898 (ἐπὶ τῷδε δ' ἠγόρευε)-902 (κἀπὶ τῷδ' ἀνίσταται)-917 (ἄλλος δ' ἀναστὰς ἔλεγε); *Ba.* 705 (ἐκπηδᾷ)-707 (ἐξανῆκ').

[110] For the historic present as a form of *variatio*, see Ros 282-9.

[111] Cf. Lausberg 142: "Die *variatio* als Gesamterscheinung der Rhetorik wirkt dem *taedium* des Publikums entgegen"). Note also Wolfson's research on the conversational historic present, i.e. "historic presents in narratives which occur in everyday conversational interaction." She discovers that it is not so much the switch into the historic present which is effective, but any switch from past tense into historic present *and vice versa.*

[112] Cf. Ros 283: "was nun aber als Hauptereignis einer Erzählung in den Vordergrund gerückt wird, ist zum grossen Teil durch die freie Wahl des Schriftstellers bedingt. Denn dem einen erscheint als wichtig oder eindrucksvoll, was ein anderer anders bewertet".

she breaks down; the cluster of historic presents impresses this scene upon our memory.

In the case of

> χρυσοῦν τε θεῖσα στέφανον ἀμφὶ βοστρύχοις
> λαμπρῷ κατόπτρῳ <u>σχηματίζεται</u> κόμην, ...
> κἄπειτ' ἀναστᾶσ' ἐκ θρόνων <u>διέρχεται</u>
> στέγας, ..., δώροις ὑπερχαίρουσα

having placed the golden crown on her curls, she <u>arranges</u> her hair in a shining mirror, ... and then having stood up from her throne she <u>parades through</u> the house, ..., extremely happy with her presents

(*Med.* 1160-5)

the historic presents describe actions which are not in themselves particularly important or decisive,[113] since the princess's decision to accept and put on the gifts has already been taken (in aorists: ᾔνεσ' (1157) and λαβοῦσα ... ἠμπέσχετο ... θεῖσα (1159-60)). It is by way of preparation for what is to come that the Messenger pays special attention to the way she arranges her hair and daintily parades through the palace.[114] Later, when the poison takes effect, the princess will try with all her might to tear the crown *from* her hair (1191-4), and will *flee* through the palace (1190). The repetition in 1190 of ἀναστᾶσ' ἐκ θρόνων from 1163, in particular, calls to mind the earlier, happy scene and thereby brings home the terrible contrast with the princess's present plight.

The two historic presents in *Med.* 1169 mark a new episode in the story (cf. τοὐνθένδε in 1167): the poison is starting to do its work.[115]

The messenger-speech of *Heracl.* contains only one historic present, which throws into relief the climax of Iolaus' pursuit of Eurystheus,

[113] On this point I disagree with Rijksbaron's analysis of the passage (1984: 23): "After a series of aorist indicatives the cardinal actions are expressed in the historic present."

[114] For similar cases, see *Ion* 1193 bis (cf. 1202-3), *Or.* 1444 bis.

[115] For similar cases, see *IT* 298 (cf. κἀν τῷδε in 301): when the stranger launches his attack on the cattle, this forces the herdsmen into action; *Ion* 1196 (cf. κἀν τῷδε): doves (which will save Ion's life) enter on the scene; *Ba.* 728 (Agave passes the Messenger, who goes into action and thus triggers the aggression of the Maenads).

which is itself the climax of the battle between Heraclids + Athenians and Argives:[116]

> αἱρεῖ δ' ὁ κλεινὸς Ἰόλεως Εὐρυσθέως
> τέτρωρον ἅρμα πρὸς πέτραις Σκιρωνίσιν
>
> and the famous Iolaus captures Eurystheus' four-wheeled chariot near the Scironian rocks
>
> (*Heracl.* 859-60)

In the messenger-speech in *Andr.*, 9 out of a total of 11 historic presents refer to Neoptolemus, who is thereby placed in the spotlights by the Messenger, his faithful servant.
In the following passage,

> πλῆρες δ' ἐν χεροῖν λαβὼν δέπας
> πάγχρυσον αἴρει χειρὶ παῖς 'Αχιλλέως
> χοὰς θανόντι πατρί· σημαίνει δέ μοι
> σιγὴν 'Αχαιῶν παντὶ κηρῦξαι στρατῷ.
>
> Having taken the golden bowl with both hands, the son of Achilles lifts it to bring an offering to his dead father: and he beckons to me to command silence to the whole army of Achaeans.
>
> (*Hec.* 527-30)

the two historic presents call attention to the beginning of the ceremony which will lead to Polyxena's sacrifice.[117]

In *HF* 995-1001 the cluster of six historic presents mirrors the rapid succession of events, portraying Heracles' mad fury, which not even a door can contain.[118]
In the next passage,

[116] Cf. *Hec.* 567, *HF* 979, *Ion* 1207, *Ph.* 1181, and most instances of πίπτει/πίτνει.

[117] Similar cases are to be found in *Hipp.* 1188 (beginning of Hippolytus' fatal journey), *Andr.* 1111 (beginning of Neoptolemus' downfall), *El.* 777 (beginning of meeting between Orestes and Aegisthus), *Ion* 1143 (the first stage in the covering of the roof, note πρῶτον μὲν), *Ph.* 1392 (duel becomes serious after preliminary skirmishes).

[118] Note also the asyndeton σκάπτει μοχλεύει (999) and the metaphor ἱππεύει (1001). Similar cases: *El.* 830 bis, *Ion* 1210-19; and cf. (in a pseudo messenger-speech) *Hec.* 1171 κεντοῦσιν αἱμάσσουσιν.

ἀλλ' ἦν ἄπιστον· μυρίων γὰρ ἐκ χερῶν
οὐδεὶς τὰ τῆς θεοῦ θύματ' εὐτύχει βαλών.

But it was unbelievable: for from countless hands nobody manages to hit the goddess's victims.

(*IT* 328-9)

the historic present gives expression to the Messenger's incredulity, then and now.[119]

In the case of

ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἀγρόθεν πυλῶν ἔσω
βαίνων, ...
ὁρῶ δ' ὄχλον στείχοντα καὶ θάσσοντ' ἄκραν

I happened to be coming inside the gates from the country, ...
And I see a crowd coming and taking seats on the summit

(*Or.* 866-71, transl. M.L. West)

the Messenger not only stresses the fact that he was an eyewitness, but through his use of the historic present also asks our special attention for *what* he has seen and is about to recount. Here, in *Or.* 871, we find ourselves at the beginning of the story,[120] but ὁρῶ also occurs later on in messenger-speeches, when the messenger sees something exciting or surprising, e.g.:

τέλος δὲ πᾶσιν ἦν αὐτὸς λόγος,
στείχειν ἵν' ἦσαν, καίπερ οὐκ ἐωμένοις.
κἀνταῦθ' ὁρῶμεν Ἑλλάδος νεὼς σκάφος

and finally we all had the same thought, to go where they were, although we were not allowed to do so. And there we see a Greek ship

(*IT* 1343-5)[121]

[119] Cf. *Andr.* 1153 where the historic present gives expression to the Messenger's indignation.

[120] And cf. *Supp.* 653, *Ph.* 1099, *Ba.* 680.

[121] Other examples: *Ph.* 1165, *Or.* 879, *Ba.* 1063. Note that aorists are also found: εἴδομεν (*Hipp.* 1206, *IT* 323), ἐσείδομεν (*IT* 308, 1354), ἔδρακον (*Or.* 1456 bis).

This passage concludes my discussion of the historic present in the Euripidean messenger-speech. To sum up the main points: the frequent use of the historic present is in keeping with the messenger's technique of mentally going back in time and recounting the events as he experienced them, i.e. of narrating according to his experiencing focalization.[122] Generally speaking, he uses historic presents to draw his addressees into the story, to allow them to share his own experience. The lowest level of engagement results from the historic present as *variatio*, which serves to hold the attention of the hearers. Historic presents may also be used to direct their attention towards certain events, which are thereby marked as important or decisive. Thus the messenger may draw attention to the starting point of a series of events, to the climax or to new developments along the way. Using historic presents in clusters, he may single out persons or events, or bring to life a quick succession of events. Even if we allow for a certain degree of idiosyncrasy (πίτνει) on the part of Euripides, the historic present is a subtle narrative instrument in the hands of his representative, the messenger.

By way of transition to the discussion of narrating focalization in the messenger-speech, I will look first at a narrative technique which is quite close to narrating focalization, i.e. the implicit anticipation of events to come.

Implicit anticipations (prolepses)

One consequence of the fact that the messenger is narrating according to his focalization as experiencing character is that we find no anticipations,[123] or, in Genette's terminology, *prolepses* of the type in which the *Iliad* abounds:

ὁ δὲ κλισίηθεν ἀκούσας
ἔκμολεν ἶσος Ἄρῃ, κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή.

[122] Cf. Rijksbaron 1984: 24: "The use of the historic present in messenger-speeches ... may rightly be described as an attempt to create an 'eyewitness-effect' ...: after all, the messenger has, in fact, witnessed the events which he reports".

[123] Cf. Henning 23: "nuntius raro finem narrationis anticipat".

And he [Patroclus] having heard him [Achilles] from inside the tent came outside, like Ares, and this was the beginning of his evil.

(11.603-4)[124]

In other words, in a Euripidean messenger-speech the events are presented in chronological order,[125] without prolepses (or, for that matter, analepses, i.e. retroversions).[126]

The absence of *explicit* prolepses does not, however, mean that the messenger does not occasionally prepare his addressees for things to come. We have already seen how historic presents can be used to focus on preliminary events which later will gain special significance. In this subsection I will discuss other examples of preparation, or, what might be termed, *implicit* prolepsis.

In

λαμπρῷ κατόπτρῳ σχηματίζεται κόμην,
ἄψυχον εἰκὼ προσγελῶσα σώματος.

in a shining mirror she arranges her hair, smiling at her lifeless image.

(*Med.* 1161-2)

the word ἄψυχον is, according to Erdmann 132, n. 3, ambiguous and as such foreshadows the disaster which is to befall the princess: "ἄψυχος ist gewiß jedes Spiegelbild, hier aber reflektiert der Spiegel eine Person, die schon das Kleid und den Kranz des Todes trägt".[127] In that same messenger-speech we find another unobtrusive prolepsis:

πίτνει δ' ἐς οὖδας ...
πλὴν τῷ τεκόντι κάρτα δυσμαθὴς ἰδεῖν

[124] See Genette 77-121 and De Jong 1987a: 81-90. Note that Odysseus' first-person narrative does contain prolepses, e.g. 9.553-5 (Suerbaum 157).

[125] Which is not necessarily the most natural or logical order for a first-person narrator; see pp. 49-50.

[126] Cf. Erdmann 90 and 179, Kannicht 398, Collard 1981: 21. According to Romberg 115, a "straightforward chronology" is typical for the "first-person novel between Petronius and Proust".

[127] Cf. Elliott: "Glauce's reflection grimly anticipates the sequel: it has no psyche, and soon she will lose hers".

> she [Creon's daughter] falls on the ground ... very difficult to recognize except for the one who begot her
>
> (*Med.* 1195-6)

The insertion of πλὴν τῷ τεκόντι, together with 1177-9, prepares us for Creon's entrance in 1204.[128] Thus the prolepsis serves to ease the transition from the death-scene of Creon's daughter to that of Creon himself.

In

> ἡμεῖς μὲν ἀκτῆς κυμοδέγμονος πέλας
> ... ἐκτενίζομεν
>
> we were busy combing ... near the wave-receiving shore
>
> (*Hipp.* 1173-4)

the word κυμοδέγμονος — which is a *hapax* in the (extant) plays of Euripides and in the whole of classical Greek literature — draws attention to that aspect of the shore which is most relevant for events to come: the bull from the sea which will cause Hippolytus' death is put ashore by an enormous wave (1205-14, note κῦμ': 1207 and 1214, τρικυμίᾳ: 1213).

In

> ἐπεὶ τὸ κλεινὸν ἤλθομεν Φοίβου πέδον
>
> After we had come to the famous ground of Phoebus
>
> (*Andr.* 1085)

the word κλεινόν is used, in the first place, in connection with what immediately follows (1086-7): the sightseeing of Neoptolemus and his retainers. At the same time, it sets the tone for a theme to be voiced by the Messenger several times throughout this narrative, viz. the abuse of this famous and holy place for such a base assassination (for this theme see also pp. 82-3).[129]

[128] Cf. Wecklein: "Mit diesen Worten weiß der Dichter die Spannung auf Kreons Auftreten wieder anzufachen."

[129] Stevens notes that κλεινόν is a "favourite epithet in Euripides for places and people, used eight times of Athens and certainly appropriate for Delphi, perhaps the most renowned spot in Hellas". However, except for this instance, the epithet is

In

> λαμπρὰ μὲν ἀκτὶς ἡλίου, κανὼν σαφής,
> ἔβαλλε γαῖαν

> A brilliant shaft of sunlight, clear measurer, struck the earth
> (*Supp.* 650-1)

the brilliance of the sun foreshadows the "happy turn of events" (Collard 1975: 280, ad 650-2).

In

> ὁρῶ δὲ θιάσους τρεῖς γυναικείων χορῶν

> And I see three bands of women dancers
> (*Ba.* 680, transl. G.S. Kirk)

the words θιάσους and χορῶν are at first sight somewhat strange, considering that the women are asleep at the moment the Messenger spots them (683-6). Two explanations may account for the use of these words here. It appears, from Pentheus' words in 216-25, that people knew of the presence of dancing groups of Theban Maenads in the mountains (cf. χοροῖς: 220 and θιάσοις: 221) by way of rumour (κλύω: 216). We may assume that the Messenger had heard these rumours too. What he offers is the first *eyewitness* account of things previously known by rumour only.[130] The second explanation is that the Messenger uses θιάσους and χορῶν in anticipation of the Bacchic dancing which he will watch in 723-7.

In

> Πενθεὺς δ' ὁ τλήμων θῆλυν οὐχ ὁρῶν ὄχλον
> ἔλεξε τοιάδ'·

never used by Euripides to refer to Delphi (not even in the *Ion*), which may confirm that its use here has a special meaning.

[130] In this way I would also account for the Messenger's knowledge of the Bacchic *t.t.* θιάσους, which troubles Roux 460, ad 680-2: "par une de ces invraisemblances dont ne se soucient guère les Tragiques grecs, le berger employe sans embarras le terme propre pour désigner ces thiases tout nouvellement créés". It is also clear from 664-5 (Βάκχας ..., αἳ τῆσδε γῆς οἴστροισι λευκὸν κῶλον ἐξηκόντισαν) that the Messenger does not come upon the Theban Maenads without any foreknowledge of their presence in the mountains (as Roux and Lacroix ad 680 suggest).

> But the wretched Pentheus, since he could not see the throng of women, spoke these words
>
> (*Ba.* 1058-9, transl. G.S. Kirk)

the Messenger calls Pentheus τλήμων in anticipation of what is to come, since strictly speaking at this stage Pentheus is not yet 'miserable'.[131] At the same time it reminds the spectators of what they know will follow: Pentheus' horrible death.

Apart from these implicit prolepses in the form of substantives or adjectives (epithets), there are announcements of the type:

> τοὐνθένδε μέντοι δεινὸν ἦν θέαμ' ἰδεῖν
>
> what happened from that moment on was a terrible sight to see
>
> (*Med.* 1167)

In this way the messenger 'programs' his audience's emotional response to what is to follow.[132]

In the discussion of implicit prolepses we have seen how the messenger may make a subtle use of his *ex eventu* knowledge, and this foreshadows the subject of the next subsection.

Narrating focalization

In the corpus of Euripidean messenger-speeches, narrating focalization forms an exception to the rule of experiencing focalization. I will look first at a few incidental examples, before discussing the messenger-speeches of *Andr.*, *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2) in which narrating focalization is the dominant mode.

In *IT* 264-8 the Messenger presents the following sequence of events: (1) one of us saw two young men, (2) he crawled back, and (3) said: "don't you see these two gods?" At first sight this chronological

[131] Lacroix's remark ("c'est la première note d'émotion dans le récit du messager, qui s'attache à rapporter objectivement les faits") is therefore beside the point: the Messenger shows his engagement even *before* this is warranted by the content of his story.

[132] Other examples are *Supp.* 707 (κἀν τῷδε) and *Ba.* 1063 (τοὐντεῦθεν ἤδη, cp. Roux: "les deux adverbes soulignent vigoureusement la transition et montrent que le messager est conscient d'aborder un point capital de son récit").

sequence may seem natural enough. Upon reflection, however, we realize that the Messenger must have experienced the events in this order: (2) one of us came crawling back, and (3) said: "don't you see these two gods". At the moment of narration the Messenger abandons the order of events as he himself experienced them in favour of a chronological order — presumably to make his narrative more lucid —, and adds event 1, which he knows must have taken place.
A second, more stirring, example is

ὁ δὲ λαβὼν ἐξαίρετον,
ὡς τῷ νέῳ δὴ δεσπότῃ χάριν φέρων,
ἔδωκε πλῆρες τεῦχος, εἰς οἶνον βαλὼν
ὅ φασι δοῦναι φάρμακον δραστήριον
δέσποιναν

And he [the Old man] took a specially chosen cup, as if to do his new master a favour, and gave it, full, after he had poured into the wine the strong poison they say my mistress had given him

(*Ion* 1182-6)

The Messenger relates the events in their chronological order, although he only learnt about the πώματος μηχανάς later, when the Old Man is forced to make a full confession: 1215-6. He explicitly indicates that 1182-6 is *ex eventu* knowledge, by adding that at that point none of the participants knew about the poison: κοὐδεὶς τάδ' ᾔδειν (1187).[133] Note also ὡς ... δὴ + participle in 1183: speaking from hindsight he knows that the Old Man only *pretended* to do his new master a favour.[134] The reason that the Messenger inserts this piece of *ex eventu* knowledge is apparently to stress Ion's narrow and miraculous escape from death, as described in 1187-1208. Thus the "discrepant aware-

[133] Hence, their surprise (ἐθάμβησεν δὲ πᾶς) in 1205-6 at the bird's plight.

[134] Cf. Owen: "the pretended object was a compliment, the real intention was murder". For this use of ὡς + participle, see Rijksbaron 1976b: 153, n. 51: "There are also cases of ὡς + participle where the factivity of what is expressed by the participle is not merely uncertain but clearly absent; in such cases ὡς has the value as if (e.g. [*Hdt.*] 1,112,3)". Cf. *IT* 1338 (ὡς ... νίζουσα δή), discussed on p. 54.

ness"[135] between the participants in the story (who do not know about the poison) and the spectators (who do)[136] serves to create suspense.

A particularly complex passage is *Ba.* 712-22 (ἔδοξε):[137] a) if you had been present, says the Messenger to Pentheus, you would have prayed; b) we (the herdsmen), who were present at the time, deliberated what to do and c) one of us, a man glib of tongue, suggested hunting Agave, d) which seemed a good idea to us. Remark (**a**) comes forth from the Messenger's present attitude of reverence toward Dionysus and Maenadism (cf. 769-74). At that time, however, he and his fellow herdsmen did not pray, but deliberated (**b**). Again in retrospect, the Messenger now puts in an unfavourable light (**c**) the colleague who issued the suggestion to hunt Agave, which at that time they embraced (**d**). This complex mixture of experiencing and narrating focalization reflects the conversion to the cult of Dionysus which the Messenger has undergone and wishes his master to undergo.

In *IT* 275-6 we find a slightly different situation: at the moment of narration the Messenger still disparages the speaker who in fact gave the most correct interpretation and whose suggestion to hunt the strangers was adopted, executed and in no way regretted by the Messenger and the other herdsmen (cf. 336-9). Thus here the Messenger does *not* replace his experiencing focalization[138] by a narrating one, although the former has proved unsound.

Or. (2) contains one instance of narrating focalization: Helen followed Orestes to the hearth οὐ πρόμαντις ὢν ἔμελλεν (1445). However, when Helen was not suspicious, her Phrygian servants were, and from the very beginning of his story the Messenger leaves little doubt about the evil intentions of Orestes and Pylades: λέοντες Ἕλλανες (1401),[139]

[135] For this term, see p. 57.

[136] In fact, the Messenger's internal and external addressees knew of the poison intrigue even before the messenger-scene, thanks to the onstage planning in 978-1038.

[137] Winnington-Ingram 1948: 93 drew my attention to the complexity of focalization in this passage.

[138] Cf. Grube 55: "our messenger so obviously was one of the god-fearing himself that he cannot but recall by his language what he thought *at the time* of the bold fellow who pricked the bubble of their credulity" (my italics).

[139] According to Willink ad 1400-1, the 'lion' image can be 'admiring' or 'pejorative'. Here, I think, the Messenger uses it to indicate the aggressiveness and

κακόμητις ἀνήρ, οἷος Ὀδυσσεύς,[140] σιγᾷ δόλιος (1403-5), φόνιος ... δράκων (1406 and cf. μητροφόντας δράκων in 1424),[141] κακοῦργος (1407), κακὸς Φωκεύς (1447), ὡς κάπροι (1460).[142] Even the standard assertion of restricted understanding in 1418-24 (some thought it was not a trap, others did), clearly favours the second alternative, which is described in nine words as against the single οὔ of the first alternative. In other words, in this messenger-speech the (fearful and suspicious) experiencing focalization of the Messenger approaches *ex eventu* knowledge and acts as a sustained anticipation of the act of murder, ... a murder which, however, never takes place. We have uncovered another narrative technique which is employed to further the *suggestio falsi* that Helen is being killed (see pp. 18-9 and 23 above).

Dominant narrating focalization

By way of exception, in the messenger-speeches of *Andr.*, *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2) the messenger narrates mainly according to his narrating focalization. The passage *Andr.* 1088-99 has been briefly reviewed on p. 29: the Messenger recounts Orestes' malicious campaign against Neoptolemus, and the action then undertaken by the Delphians, events he could have heard about only afterwards (note again the explicit: οὐδὲν τῶνδέ πω πεπυσμένοι: 1101).[143] The second instance of narrating focalization in this messenger-speech is:

> κἀνταῦθ' Ὀρέστου μῦθος ἰσχύων μέγα
> ἐφαίνεθ', ὡς ψεύδοιτο δεσπότης ἐμός,
> ἥκων ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς.

hostile intentions of Orestes and Pylades, which frighten the Phrygians. Cf. Menelaus' remark in 1554-5 (ἥκω κλύων τὰ δεινὰ καὶ δραστήρια δισσοῖν λεόντοιν· οὐ γὰρ ἄνδρ' αὐτὼ καλῶ) and λέων ὅπως in *IT* 297, where the 'lion' image reflects the herdsmen's focalization of Orestes' attack on their cattle.

140 For the comparison, see p. 91.

141 For the negative connotations of the 'snake' image, see Willink ad 479-80.

142 For the comparison, see p. 90.

143 Stevens ad 1091 ("we need not ask how the messenger knows this ... narration") has overlooked the explanation of *ex eventu* knowledge, which in effect imposes itself because of πω: not yet, hence later.

And at that point Orestes' word proved stronger, that my master was lying and came with bad intentions.

(*Andr.* 1109-11)

What must have happened is that the Delphians, having heard Neoptolemus' assertion that he came with pious intentions (1106-8), said nothing and allowed him to proceed with the ceremony (ἔρχεται ... ἐντός: 1111-2), seemingly accepting his statement. However — and this the Messenger can only deduce from hindsight — they did not believe him and hence continued the secret plan against him. The third instance of narrating focalization is:

τῷ δὲ ξιφήρης ἆρ' ὑφειστήκει λόχος
δάφνῃ σκιασθείς, ὧν Κλυταιμήστρας τόκος
εἷς ἦν ἁπάντων τῶνδε μηχανορράφος.

but against him an armed band lay in ambush, covered by the laurel-trees, it being Clytemnestra's son who alone was the schemer of all these things.

(*Andr.* 1114-6)[144]

Note the presence of the particle ἄρα/ἆρα here, and in 1088, which underscores that the Messenger is *reconstructing* events which at that time were not known or visible to him and his master: 'as it subsequently transpired'.[145] The Messenger's departure in *Andr.* from the rule of experiencing focalization serves a definite function: as a servant of Neoptolemus, he is anxious to call attention to Orestes'

[144] I agree with Stevens 212, ad 1008 that Orestes was not himself present at the murder. Hence I concur with him in not reading a comma after εἷς ἦν and taking ὧν as neuter. In addition to the arguments which he has collected, note Neoptolemus' questions in 1125-6, which imply that he does not see Orestes among his attackers.

[145] Cf. Denniston 1954: 36.2 ("the reality of a past event is presented as apprehended ... at the moment of speaking") and 45.2 ("marking realization of the truth"). The particle seems to me perfectly understandable both in 1088 and 1114 (contra Stevens ad 1114). ἄρα is found only once more in a messenger-speech (*Hel.* 1537, and *Ba.* 1113? see Dodds *ad loc.*), again in a passage with narrating focalization: cf. Dale "as we realized later" and Kannicht "in ἄρα liegt der nachträgliche Anagnorismos".

scheming right from the beginning. In other words, he uses this narrative technique to indict Orestes.[146]

In the messenger-speech in *IT* (2) the first instance of narrating focalization is found in the opening lines:

> ἐπεὶ πρὸς ἀκτὰς ἤλθομεν θαλασσίας,
> οὗ ναῦς Ὀρέστου κρύφιος ἦν ὡρμισμένη
>
> After we had come to the sea-shore, where Orestes' ship was secretly anchored
>
> (*IT* 1327-8)

The Messenger does not learn that there was a ship concealed until 1345, and the identity of the stranger/Orestes only becomes known to him in 1361. Then, in his presentation of Iphigeneia's behaviour in 1329-38, he makes it very clear that she is deceiving him and his fellow sailors:

> χρόνῳ δ', ἵν' ἡμῖν δρᾶν τι δὴ δοκοῖ πλέον,
> ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ κατῇδε βάρβαρα
> μέλη μαγεύουσ', ὡς φόνον νίζουσα δή.
>
> And after some time she started to cry out, in order of course to seem to us to be doing something, and sang barbarian songs using magic arts, pretending to be washing off the blood.
>
> (*IT* 1336-8)

The narrating focalization of the Messenger is shown by δοκοῖ, the repeated δή, and ὡς + participle (see note 134). This messenger-speech also contains a number of instances of restricted understanding, but, as in the case of *Or.* (2), they take the form of strong suspicions, which in effect border on knowledge: καὶ τάδ' ἦν ὕποπτα μέν (1334), ἐσῆλθεν ἡμᾶς μὴ λυθέντες οἱ ξένοι κτάνοιεν αὐτὴν δραπέται τ' οἰχοίατο (1340-1). The Messenger's frequent use of narrating focalization in this messenger-speech is understandable and, again, functional: he must report a failed mission to his superior, King Thoas, and laying bare the

[146] And there is more involved than just clarity (Erdmann 135, n. 3: "und so spricht er ganz natürlich *um einer klaren Darstellung willen* aus der Perspektive *ex eventu*", my italics).

extent and ingenuity of Iphigeneia's and Orestes' scheme will help to excuse him. The sailors had their suspicions, but Iphigeneia's command that they should not watch (1330-2) — echoing her request to Thoas in 1209-12 to forbid all Taurians to watch the purificatory rites — made them hesitate for a long time before going into action.

The same combination of technique and motive is found in *Hel.* (2), a play which, as has often been noted, shows a remarkable similarity to *IT*. Helen has asked Theoclymenus to allow her to make a sacrifice at sea for her husband, whose death has just been reported by a 'shipwrecked sailor'. Not until 1586-7 does the 'sailor'/Menelaus reveal his identity, whereupon the Egyptian sailors realize that the sacrifice at sea was a trick (1589). The Messenger, however, uses this *ex eventu* knowledge from the very beginning,[147] as the following analysis of the first half of his story (1526-1584) shows. After Helen had left for the sea, she most skilfully (σοφώταθ': 1528) lamented her husband not dead but there by her side (πέλας παρόντα κοὐ τεθνηκότα: 1529). We prepared a Sidonian ship and while busy with this, there came, having, as we realized later, waited for this moment (τοῦτ' ἄρα σκοπούμενοι: 1537) Greek men, fellow-travellers of Menelaus (Μενέλεῳ ξυνέμποροι: 1538), dressed up (ἠσθημένοι: 1539) in the rags of shipwrecks. Upon seeing them Menelaus ('Ατρέως γόνος· 1541) spoke to them, producing for our benefit a false pretence of pity (δόλιον οἶκτον ἐς μέσον φέρων: 1542). They went aboard, having shed some fictitious (ποιητῷ τρόπῳ: 1547) tears. We had our suspicions, but said nothing, in accordance with your command (1549-53). Everything else was carried aboard lightly, but the bull to be sacrificed did not want to go on board. And Helen's husband (Ἑλένης πόσις: 1559) shouted ... Finally, when everything was ready, Helen sat down in the middle of the deck, the supposedly dead Menelaus (ὁ ... οὐκέτ' ὢν λόγοισι Μενέλεως: 1572) next to her. Rower sat next to rower, keeping swords hidden under their clothes (ὑφ' εἵμασι ξίφη λαθραῖ' ἔχοντες: 1574-5). From 1586-7 onward, when Menelaus reveals his true identity, the pretending is over and the intrigue gives way to a fight in the open. Once again, we are dealing with a messenger who has to report an unsuccessful action to his superior (Theoclymenus) and who — even more markedly than in

[147] Cf. Kannicht (quoted above in note 72).

IT (2) — narrates according to his narrating focalization, so as to reveal from the very beginning the trick played upon him by Helen and Menelaus. When he refers to his restricted understanding (in 1549-53), it is to make clear that it was in fact Theoclymenus' order to obey the stranger in all respects — given at the instigation of Helen in 1414-7 — which prevented them from giving heed to their suspicions. In other words, the Messenger not only tries to excuse himself, but also attempts to shift responsibility for the defeat to his superior Theoclymenus.[148]

The interesting thing is that this messenger-speech functions as a kind of mirror-story or *mise en abime*:[149] the central theme both of the play as a whole and of this messenger-speech is the confrontation between illusion and reality (δόξα-ἀλήθεια, in particular σῶμα-ὄνομα, see Kannicht 57-68). Just as the false Helen has fooled Paris, Menelaus and all the Greeks and Trojans, a false stranger now fools Theoclymenus and the Egyptian sailors.[150] However, the Messenger is more suspicious than his superior Theoclymenus and illustrates, as it were, his own maxim (1617-8: σώφρονος δ' ἀπιστίας οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χρησιμώτερον βροτοῖς) by telling the story according to his narrating focalization. His lavish display of *ex eventu* knowledge confirms the validity of his suspicions at the time.

We see that the three exceptions to the rule of experiencing focalization in Euripidean messenger-speeches, *Andr.*, *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2)), are effective exceptions. The messengers reveal quite early on the intrigues of which they and their masters are the victims, with the express purpose of indicting another (*Andr.*) or exculpating themselves (*IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2)).

Thus far the present chapter has dealt with the messenger's understanding and foreknowledge. He is, however, not the only one who is relevant in this respect; there are also the other participants in the action, as well as his internal and external adressees, whose understanding and foreknowledge may differ from his.

[148] I will return to this shifting of responsibility in Ch. 2, p. 104.

[149] For this concept of the 'story within a story' or 'play within a play', see De Jong 1985 and Aélion.

[150] Kannicht 69-71 discusses the analogy between "Theoklymenoshandlung" and "Eidolonversion des Helenastoffes", but does not include the messenger-speech in his analysis.

1.5 Discrepant awareness

The term *discrepant awareness* is borrowed from Pfister, who defines it as follows:

> discrepant awareness refers to two different relationships. First, there are the differences in levels of awareness of the various dramatic figures, and, secondly, there are those between the fictional figures and the audience. (50)[151]

In the case of the Euripidean messenger-speech — and again I will concentrate mainly on the *mechanema* messenger-speeches — the messenger's external audience is always aware of that intrigue, because they have overheard how it was planned or announced onstage, as in *El.* 598-639, for example. These plans or announcements may be more specific (e.g. *Med.*) or less specific (e.g. *Andr.*),[152] but even in the former case there are enough details which remain to be filled in later by the messenger's report.

As regards the messenger's internal audience, consisting of the chorus or chorus and one of the protagonists (see Appendix D), the situation is as follows. The chorus is always aware of the intrigue since they, like the external audience, hear it planned or announced onstage. The inevitable and permanent presence of the chorus on stage may even make it necessary for some plotters to solicit their co-operation, i.e. their silence (*Med.* 822-3 and *IT* 1056-74). Of the protagonist-addressees, some are aware of the intrigue (Medea in *Med.*, Electra in *El.*), while others are not (Peleus in *Andr.*, Thoas in *IT* (2), Theoclymenus in *Hel.* (2)).

Finally, there are the other participants in the action. Of these, the intriguers are obviously aware of their own intrigue, and the victims unaware. Observe that three of the six victims die while they are still unaware of the intrigue which has brought about their downfall:

[151] In Chapter 2 we will see that not only the cognitive but also the emotional position of messenger and participants on the one hand, and addressees on the other, may differ.

[152] For a more detailed discussion of the anticipations of messenger-speeches, see pp. 123-7.

Τίνος μ' ἕκατι κτείνετ' εὐσεβεῖς ὁδοὺς
ἥκοντα; ποίας ὄλλυμαι πρὸς αἰτίας;
τῶν δ' οὐδὲν οὐδεὶς ...
ἐφθέγξατ'

"Why do you kill me [Neoptolemus], who have come with a pious mission? For what reason do I die?" But no one ... said anything to him in reply
(*Andr.* 1125-8)[153]

Curiously enough, Hippolytus knows about his father's curse (*Hipp.* 1241), although he was not present when it was uttered (887-90).[154]

Within this group of unknowing participants, varying degrees of unawareness can be distinguished. Thus in the messenger-speech in *Med.*, Creon, upon entering the scene in 1204, is unaware of the specific nature of his daughter's death (συμφορᾶς ἀγνωσίᾳ: 1204), viz. through a poison which kills anyone who touches it, while the servants know (τύχην γὰρ εἴχομεν διδάσκαλον: 1203). In the messenger-speech in *Andr.* the Delphians are of course aware that they are preparing an ambush for Neoptolemus, yet unaware that they are being exploited by Orestes to settle his private score with Neoptolemus. In *HF* Heracles' family and servants soon realize that he has gone mad, although they do not know — as do the Messenger's internal and external addressees — that Hera caused the madness (cf. Amphitryon's question in 965-7). Heracles himself is unaware both of his own madness and its divine origin.[155] In *Or.* (2) Helen is, as we have seen above (p. 51), less suspicious than her servants. By far the most complex example in this

[153] Cf. Creon in *Med.* 1208-10 (strangely enough he does not mention Medea as the cause of his daughter's death, although he had feared an attack by her in 282-91), and Aegisthus in *El.* (until the end he remains unaware that the Thessalian stranger is in fact his archenemy Orestes). Ion, who survives the deadly trap set for him, in 1215-6 gets an answer to his question Τίς μ' ἔμελλεν ἀνθρώπων κτανεῖν; (1210).

[154] Commentators have given the following explanations: 1) Hippolytus must have heard about the curse from an attendant who had been present (Grube 186, Barrett *ad loc.*); 2) Euripides does not care, because the audience knows about the curse (Wecklein); 3) Euripides is careless (Méridier); and 4) Hippolytus is clairvoyant at the moment of his death (Pohlenz 268). No matter how Hippolytus got his information, it is clear that the Messenger's knowledge of the curse (1167) is based on Hippolytus' words in 1241.

[155] Cf. Lyssa's announcement in 865-6 (ὁ δὲ κανὼν οὐκ εἴσεται παῖσας οὓς ἔτικτεν ἐναρών).

series is *Ba.* (2). As was set out above (pp. 36-7), the Messenger gradually grasps the true identity of the stranger, but when does Pentheus' moment of understanding come? He must have heard and seen what the Messenger heard and saw in 1077ff., but the first indication of his mental state does not appear until 1112-3: he fell on the ground μυρίοις οἰμώγμασιν, 'since — as the Messenger infers — he was beginning to understand that he was close to ruin'. Pentheus' words in 1118-21 make clear that (1) his Dionysian delusion, from which he suffered from 918 onwards, is over, and he recognizes his mother; and (2) he has finally learned the lesson Dionysus wanted to teach him all along, viz. that it was wrong to oppose him (ταῖς ἐμαῖς ἁμαρτίαισι). And what of the other victim of Dionysus, Agave? She spots Pentheus in 1095, but does not recognize him.[156] In 1107-9 (τὸν ἀμβάτην θῆρ' ὡς ἕλωμεν, μηδ' ἀπαγγείλῃ ...) she seems to be suffering from double vision, seeing Pentheus as both beast and man, just as Pentheus saw Dionysus as both bull and man in 918-22.[157] Pentheus' words in 1118-21 cannot remove her delusion (1124: οὐδ' ἔπειθέ νιν), and after the *sparagmos* she comes to see Pentheus as a lion (1141-2).[158] Her moment of understanding will come only *after* the messenger-speech (1284ff.).

The methodological importance of taking discrepant awareness into account is illustrated by my last example, taken from the *Ion.* Owen remarks on πρέσβυς in 1171: "It is assumed that the spectators will recognize the identity of the old man, though all that he [the Messenger] has said is 'an old man'; he must suppose that the Chorus, privy to the plot, must see who is meant." The spectators will indeed have understood the πρέσβυς to be the Old Man (πρεσβύτης) of the preceding onstage planning scene, who had entered and left the stage so manifestly an old man (cf. 725, 739-40, and 1041). The same holds true for the Chorus, who, moreover, had explicitly told the Messenger in the introductory dialogue that they were aware of the whole plot (1113-4). To the Messenger and the other participants (Ion and the Delphians) the

156 The denomination δεσπότην derives from the Messenger, who intrudes upon the focalization of the Maenads (subject of εἶδον), see Ch. 2, p. 96.

157 Gregory 1985: 31, n. 26.

158 For the comparison ὡς ὀρεστέρου ... λέοντος, see p. 93-94.

Old Man will at first have been no more than an old man, who, moreover, takes care to preclude any suspicion of his activities by conducting himself in a comical fashion (1172-3)[159]. Thus the Messenger's use of πρέσβυς reflects his own perception, but at the same time is perfectly understandable to his addressees.

In conclusion. We have seen that discrepant awareness, the difference in awareness both between characters, and between characters and spectators, which is acknowledged to be an important dramatic technique, also plays a vital role in the messenger-speech.

1.6 Conclusion. The messenger as 'I as witness'-narrator

Despite the preponderance of third-person predicates and the invisible presence of the messenger throughout most of his story, the Euripidean messenger-speech qualifies as a first-person narrative, since it meets the criterion that the narrator plays a role in his own narrative. The messenger, who is a servant, farmer, herdsman, soldier or sailor, is obviously never the protagonist of his own narrative. He is an 'I as witness'-narrator. This qualification is doubly apt, since the messenger is literally an eyewitness of events which his internal and external addressees did not themselves see, and which he reports to them.

Of the three restrictions which first-person narration entails (restriction of place, of access, and of understanding), the first (restriction of place) generally plays no role, since the events occur in one place. On occasion it is cleverly evaded by Euripides, who gives his messenger an Olympian viewpoint on the walls of Thebes (*Supp.*), makes him a shieldbearer who roams over the battlefield (*Ph.* (1)), or makes him rely on hearsay (second half of *Heracl.*); in two cases it is violated implicitly (first half of *Heracl.*, *Andr.*), and in one case explicitly (*Or.* (2)). The restriction of access is not of great importance either, in view of the loquacity of most of the characters in the messenger's narrative. The messenger is also quite apt at inferring another character's inner thoughts or motives, either from his own perceptions or from the actions and words of that character. The third restriction, that of understanding, is fully exploited

[159] Thus 1173-84 is not just "an amusing description" (Grube 272), but forms part of the Old Man's execution of the intrigue.

by Euripides. The messenger — in the manner characteristic of most early Greek literature — begins by giving away the outcome of his own story, but, when recounting the events from the beginning and in detail, generally does not make use of this *ex eventu* knowledge. Thus in most messenger-speeches the messenger narrates according to his experiencing focalization. This means, in the case of *mechanema* messenger-speeches, that he recounts the events as he understood, or failed to understand or misunderstood them at the time. In the case of battles and the like, it means that he refrains from indicating beforehand who is going to win. On two occasions the messenger's understanding of certain details of his story remains restricted until the end (*IT* (1) and *Or.* (2)), with obvious theatrical effect: Iphigeneia almost kills her own brother and the spectators of *Or.* remain uncertain about Helen's fate.

The messenger's experiencing focalization also finds expression in his frequent use of historic presents, which indicate that a speaker mentally returns to the time at which the events took place. Although the effect of vividness and hence involvement on the part of the hearer should not be overestimated — idiosyncrasy and *variatio* may also be of influence here — historic presents can be used to highlight events, to single out persons, or to suggest a quick succession of events.

The messenger's technique of narrating according to his experiencing focalization provides the spectators with a double perspective: they know the outcome of the events and yet at the same time share the experience of those who do not and thus approach their ruin unwittingly.

In the course of their narrative Euripidean messengers never explicitly anticipate events which later will take place, but they do occasionally make use of implicit anticipations (such as 'the lifeless image' of Creon's daughter looking at herself in the mirror), thus gently preparing their audience for things to come.

There are three exceptional cases of messenger-speeches narrated according to the messengers' narrating focalization: *Andr.*, *IT* (2), *Hel.* (2). Here the messenger has good reason to lavishly display his *ex eventu* knowledge: he wants to make clear from the start the depravity and cunning of the plotters, especially in the cases of *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2), where he has to report to his superior on the failure of his mission.

Historically, the dominance of experiencing focalization in the corpus of Euripidean messenger-speeches — a technique which is completely absent from the Aeschylean messenger-speeches and appears only

sporadically in the Sophoclean ones — places them squarely between Odysseus' first-person narrative in the *Odyssey*, told mainly according to his omniscient narrating focalization, and the first-person narratives of the Greek novel, where a restricted experiencing focalization reigns.

CHAPTER TWO

THE STYLE OF PRESENTATION

This chapter focuses on the messenger's style of presentation. According to many scholars, the Euripidean messenger-speeches are factual and objective reports (2.1). By means of a detailed investigation of the messenger's focalization, I will show that, paradoxically, the factuality of the messenger-speech does not preclude subjectivity (2.2-4). This view is confirmed by an examination of the response to the messenger's narrative of his internal and external addressees (2.5).

2.1 Scholars on objectivity

> Where imagery in monody conveys the irrational and subjective attitudes which characterise the singer of that monody, that of the messenger must seem to convey a rational account of objective fact, the existence of which has nothing to do with him personally, except in the sense that he has happened to observe it. For the messenger is the one character in the play who is not caught up in the complicated entanglements of family dispute. He is an outsider in the sense that he is not of the same family or the same social class as the protagonists, and it is as a detached observer that he reports what he sees, as he comes upon it as it were cold, or by chance. The pictorial language of the messenger speeches, accordingly, is suited to what is demanded of an eye-witness account of a crime, poetically conceived in the narrative mode ... Euripides never allowed a messenger to lie: his description of the catastrophe, coming as it usually does at the highest point of tension in the play, is the definitive one.

I have chosen to open with this long quotation from Barlow,[1] because it touches upon all those points which are relevant to the question of the style of presentation, and formulates in detail the objectivity claim made

[1] 1971: 61. Her opinion, which is quoted approvingly by Collard 1975: 275 and Bremer 1976: 64, reappears in Barlow 1986: 14 ("the messenger is an outsider, a third person objective witness who records events in an unbiased way").

by others before her.[2] I agree that the Euripidean messenger reports (fictional) facts and that he does not lie[3] — should we doubt that Neoptolemus or Aegisthus really did die, the visual presence of their corpses shortly after the messenger-speech removes any such doubt. Compare the following remark of the chorus in *IT*:

> σιγᾶτε, φίλαι·
> τὰ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων ἀκροθίνια δὴ
> ναοῖσι πέλας τάδε βαίνει,
> οὐδ' ἀγγελίας ψευδεῖς ἔλακεν
> βουφορβὸς ἀνήρ.

Silent, friends: for here the exquisite offerings of the Greeks are coming near the temple, and the herdsman has not uttered false reports.

(*IT* 458-62)[4]

I also agree that socially the Euripidean messenger is an outsider.[5] To say, however, that he is a "detached observer", is simply not true, as has been shown, for example, by Heath 153-7 for the messenger-speech in *Hipp.*[6] Before setting out my own argument, I will look at the deeper motives which, I think, underlie this idea of the messenger-speech as objective report.

[2] E.g. Wilamowitz 1922: 186, n. 1 ("Der Bote ist unpersönlich") and 1959: 203, concerning the messenger-speech in *HF* ("Die Erzählung ist von vollendeter Anschaulichkeit und epischer Objektivität. Die Stimmung des Erzählers, der den Hörern gleichgültig ist, hat auf ihre Farbung kaum Einfluß"); Löhrer 29 ("Nicht das tragische Miterleben der Zuhörer ist ... intendiert, sondern die möglichst wahrheitsgetreue, objektive Schilderung"); Lacroix ad *Ba.* 1058. The position of Erdmann (who on pp. 91-2, 86-7, 185 uses both the terms partiality and "nüchterne Sachlichkeit" at one and the same time) is not equivocal.

[3] As does the Paedagogue-Messenger in S. *El.* 680-763.

[4] Other references back to messenger-speeches are: *Hec.* 591-2 (τὸ δ' αὖ λίαν παρεῖλες ἀγγελθεῖσά μοι γενναῖος), 672-3 (Πολυξένης ... ἧς ἀπηγγέλθη τάφος πάντων Ἀχαιῶν διὰ χερὸς σπουδὴν ἔχειν;); *IT* 932 (ταῦτ' ἆρ' ἐπ' ἀκταῖς κἀνθάδ' ἠγγέλθης μανείς).

[5] As we saw in Ch. 1 (p. 4), he may be a servant, soldier, sailor, farmer or herdsman. Aeschylean and Sophoclean messengers belong to the same social class, except for Hyllus in S. *Tr.* 749-812, which passage one might, for this reason, hesitate to consider a messenger-speech.

[6] And cf. Rassow 40, Fischl 40-1, Henning 23-7, Di Gregorio 19-20, De Romilly 1956: 118-9, 1961: 20-1, 1986: 91-4.

Barlow bases her assessment of the Euripidean messenger-speech as objective and detached not only on the figure of the messenger, but also on the narrative mode, which she contrasts with the irrational and subjective lyric mode of the monody. This same idea, that the narrative mode is by its very nature unemotional, underlies the view of Löhrer (29: "eine typische Erzählung"). Wilamowitz reaches this same conclusion by way of a small detour: the messenger-speech is an epic element, epic (Homeric) narrative is objective, hence the messenger-speech is objective (1922: 186). Here we are dealing with a whole series of incorrect, or at least questionable, presuppositions. To start with, anyone who thinks that the Homeric songs were *performed* unemotionally should read Plato's *Ion*, in particular 535b-c. Elsewhere I have questioned the dogma of the objective style of presentation *within* the Homeric epics (De Jong 1987a). As regards the objectivity of the narrative mode in general, I subscribe to Bal's view (100) that no narrative is ever objective:

> Whenever events are presented, they are always presented from within a certain 'vision'. A point of view is chosen, a certain way of seeing things, a certain angle, whether 'real' historical facts are concerned or fictitious events.

In the next three sections I will analyze the position of the messenger as character, as narrator, and as focalizer, with special reference to the third aspect, which is crucial to the question of objectivity.

2.2 The messenger as character

The idea of the Euripidean messenger as a neutral and detached eyewitness is based mainly on his unobtrusiveness as a character. First, with the exception of Talthybius in *Hec.*, he is anonymous; second, with the exception of the Phrygian in *Or.* (2), he has no individual personality (ἠθοποιία); and third, he has no other part to play beyond that of messenger.[7] I will look more closely at each of these three points.

[7] For the Aeschylean and Sophoclean messengers the situation is as follows: 1) all are anonymous except Hyllus (see my remark in note 5); 2) the Messenger in A. *A.*, the Guard in S. *Ant.*, Hyllus and the Nurse in *Tr.* and the Paedagogue in *El.* all have a personality of their own, and 3) except for the Messenger in A. *A.* also have a part

The messenger's anonymity is not particularly convincing. Even in the aristocratic Homeric epics, anonymous groups of characters are occasionally given a voice.[8] *A fortiori* in Attic drama, a product of the age of democracy, and with a 'democratic' author like Euripides[9] anonymity does not prevent a character from having an opinion of his own. Thus the Messenger in *Hipp.*[10] concludes his story with:

δοῦλος μὲν οὖν ἔγωγε σῶν δόμων, ἄναξ,
ἀτὰρ τοσοῦτόν γ' οὐ δυνήσομαί ποτε,
τὸν σὸν πιθέσθαι παῖδ' ὅπως ἐστὶν κακός

I am only a slave in your household, master, but I shall never be able to believe such a monstrous thing, that your son is base

(*Hipp.* 1249-51)[11]

In the introductory dialogue in particular, the messenger freely displays his emotions, e.g.

ὤμοι μοι·
οἵας ὁ τλήμων ἀγγελῶν ἥκω τύχας
σοί τ', ὦ γεραιέ, καὶ φίλοισι δεσπότου.

Woe is me: what unhappy events do I, wretched one, come to report to you, old man, and all friends of my master.

(*Andr.* 1070-1)[12]

to play beyond that of messenger. The objectivity claim has not been voiced as often as in the case of the Euripidean messenger-speeches, except for A. *Ant.* 407-40 ("Der Bericht wirkt, bei allem Wunderbaren, durchaus sachlich": Keller 85) and *El.* 680-763 ("ein sachlicher Sportbericht": Keller 100).

[8] See De Jong 1987b.

[9] By democratic I mean that Euripides brings on stage people of all social milieus, cf. Ar. *Ra.* 948-52.

[10] I will write messenger when I mean messengers in general, and Messenger when referring to a particular Messenger in a particular play.

[11] Vellacott 219 goes even further: "the slaves in Euripides ... are loyal, honest, brave, sympathetic, shrewd, and in only two cases unscrupulous; though their problems cannot be the centre of dramatic interest, their behaviour and moral judgement are clearly on a higher level than that of most of the free men and women".

[12] See Erdmann 23-6. And cf. Aristophanes' parody e.g. in *Av.* 1170.

As regards the second point, the messenger is clearly not as individualized as the main characters, but at times we are told his age[13] or some particular aspect of his personality.[14] Moreover, he is not a messenger by profession, but only temporarily functions as one.[15] Thus not all messengers are the same, and when a play contains more than one messenger-speech, the messengers are usually different people.[16]

Indeed, Euripides chooses his personnel with care, as witness *Supp.* The Messenger is an Argive soldier (which makes his praise of the Athenian general Theseus all the more convincing: Collard 1975: 273), a servant of Capaneus (which prepares us for the Evadne-scene: Collard 1975: 276, ad 638b-40), who was taken prisoner during the Expedition of the Seven (which makes it possible for him to compare that battle and the present one, in particular the respective generals: cf. 644-6 and 726-30), and who for this reason finds himself in Thebes (which provides him with the necessary 'Olympian' position, see p. 12).[17]

It is while acting as servant, soldier, sailor, farmer or herdsman that the messenger has witnessed the events he recounts. This means that, though he usually plays no other part in the play but that of messenger

[13] Thus the Messengers in *Hec.* (cf. 497-8 and 507), *Hel.* (2) (cf. 734), and *Or.* (2) (cf. 863) are old.

[14] The Messenger in *IT* (1), for example, is god-fearing. Grube 219 remarks: "in his most successful narrations the personality of the messenger himself is fully felt".

[15] As Barrett ad *Hipp.* 1151 has aptly remarked: "the conventional translation 'messenger' is unfortunate: the ἄγγελος brings not a message, but news". The only 'real' messenger in the strict sense of the word and in the sense in which Homeric messengers are messengers, is Talthybius in *Tro.* In *Hec.* Talthybius functions mainly as a reporter, after he has delivered his message from the Atridae (508-10).

[16] *IT*: (1) herdsman, (2) servant of Thoas; *Hel.*: (1) servant of Menelaus, (2) Egyptian soldier; *Or.*: (1) Old Man, (2) Phrygian servant of Helen; *Ba.*: (1) herdsman, (2) servant of Pentheus. In the case of *Ph.* (1)-(4) the list of *dramatis personae* mentions an ἄγγελος and a ἕτερος ἄγγελος. The first messenger is a servant of Eteocles (1073-4, 1163-4, 1170-1), as is the second (1461), and one might be inclined to consider them one and the same person (see Rijksbaron 1976a: 305-6, who draws attention to the almost verbatim repetition of 1242-3 in 1359-60).

[17] Note also how the Messenger of *Hipp.* introduces himself in 1173-4 as someone in charge of Hippolytus' horses, the horses which will play such an important and dramatic role in the events to come. His knowledge of horsemanship makes him an apt reporter of Hippolytus' destruction. The detailed descriptions of the Shields of the Seven in *Ph.* (1) may be related to the 'professional' interest of the Messenger, who is himself a shieldbearer (1073-4).

(point 3 above),[18] he does play a role in his own story.[19] And as we have seen, it is precisely this role which qualifies his report as a first-person narrative. The first-person narrator, says Stanzel 1982: 124, is an "Ich mit Leib". The Messenger in *IT* (2) can only too well subscribe to this:

> ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἧσσον εἰχόμεσθα τῆς ξένης
> καὶ πρὸς σ' ἕπεσθαι διεβιαζόμεσθά νιν.
> ὅθεν τὰ δεινὰ πλήγματ' ἦν γενειάδων
>
> But we no less took hold of the stranger and tried to drag her to you. From which resulted these terrible blows on my face
>
> (*IT* 1364-6)[20]

As a result of the fact that the narrating 'I' is physically present, narratologists agree that first-person narratives cannot but be personal and subjective:

> La narration homodiégétique [=first-person narration] exclut ... le type narratif neutre. Même si le personnage essaie de se limiter à un enregistrement pur et simple du monde extérieur, il s'agira néanmoins d'une perception individuelle.[21]

When one considers also the following remark by Pfister:

> The differences between scenic presentation and narrative mediation — or between 'open' and 'hidden' action — are twofold: the form of presentation ... of hidden action is purely verbal and *linked to a particular perspective* ... [the audience] has to rely on 'second-hand information' — that is, on a

[18] The one notable exception is of course the Messenger in *Hel.* (1) (see Kannicht 168, ad 597-760). Note also the messengers in *Heracl.*, *Supp.*, and *Or.* (2), who after delivering their message, enter in a conversation with their addressees (see App. A, p. 182).

[19] Cf. Fischl 20 and Taplin 1977: 82 ("[the messenger] usually has an occupational identity, a reason for being involved").

[20] For the article in τὰ δεινα πλήγματα, cf. (in messenger-speech) *IT* 320, *Ba.* 760, 1063 (? supplevit Murray); (outside messenger-speech) *IT* 924, *Or.* 376, 1554, *Ph.* 179 (an intertextual reference to A. *Th.* 426-31?). Discussion by Jebb ad S. *Tr.* 476. In *IT* 1366 the article seems to have deictic force (Kühner-Gerth II,1 par. 461,8,b), in the other three cases in a messenger-speech, it refers to the messenger's experiencing focalization: that terrible sight/sound which I saw/heard then and as it were still see before my eyes/hear ringing in my ears.

[21] Lintvelt 39. And cf. the first characteristic of first-person narration (p. 3).

> report whose purely verbal quality makes it *much less* vivid and *objective*.(204, my italics)

it is possible to reverse the 'narrativity hence objectivity' claim. The spectators do not see the events for themselves but are told about them. By the very fact that they see them through the eyes of another, someone who, moreover, has himself been involved in the events, they are presented with a coloured version.[22]

Now one might counter that the Euripidean messenger is only an 'I as witness'-narrator (above p. 8), which diminishes the degree of his engagement. To this I would reply that all messengers, again as a result of their being servant, soldier, etc., are attached to one of the main characters of the play. Even when a messenger explicitly states that he was present by chance, as in

> <u>ἐτύγχανον</u> μὲν ἀγρόθεν πυλῶν ἔσω
> βαίνων,
>
> I <u>happened</u> to be coming inside the gates from the country,
> (*Or*. 866-7, transl. M.L. West)

this coincidence, and thus the Messenger's potential detachment, is immediately reversed by what follows:

> πυθέσθαι δεόμενος τά τ' ἀμφὶ σοῦ
> τά τ' ἀμφ' Ὀρέστου· σῷ γὰρ εὔνοιαν πατρὶ
> ἀεί ποτ' εἶχον, καί μ' ἔφερβε σὸς δόμος
> πένητα μέν, χρῆσθαι δὲ γενναῖον φίλοις.
>
> wanting to find out the state of affairs about you and Orestes (for I always used to be well disposed towards your father, and your house fed me, a poor man but honourable in service to my friends)
> (*Or*. 867-70, transl. M.L. West)

[22] Cf. De Romilly 1956: 118: "Par définition, le récit de la tragédie dénoue une attente anxieuse, il s'addresse à des gens émus; il est fait par quelqu'un qui partage leur émotion, et l'éprouve d'autant plus vivement qu'il vient de participer à l'action ou au moins d'y assister"; Craik ad *Ph*. 1067-1283: "The messenger is not an anonymous figure but deeply involved in the events he describes: this technique of the messenger as character is used to great effect in Bakchai".

Due to this Messenger's personal attachment to the house of Agamemnon, we cannot expect an impartial account.[23] Indeed the Argive citizen speaking in favour of Orestes' death is introduced by him as:

> ἀνήρ τις ἀθυρόγλωσσος, ἰσχύων θράσει,
> Ἀργεῖος οὐκ Ἀργεῖος, ἠναγκασμένος,
> θορύβῳ τε πίσυνος κἀμαθεῖ παρρησίᾳ
>
> a man with no shutters to his mouth, strong on audacity, an Argive but no true one — pressurized — reliant on hectoring and stupid abuse
> (*Or.* 903-5, transl. M.L. West)

and the man speaking against Orestes' death as:

> μορφῇ μὲν οὐκ εὐωπός, ἀνδρεῖος δ' ἀνήρ,
> ὀλιγάκις ἄστυ κἀγορᾶς χραίνων κύκλον,
> αὐτουργός — οἵπερ καὶ μόνοι σῴζουσι γῆν —
> ξυνετὸς δέ, χωρεῖν ὁμόσε τοῖς λόγοις θέλων,
> ἀκέραιος, ἀνεπίπληκτον ἠσκηκὼς βίον
>
> not physically good-looking, but a manly man, one who rarely impinges on the town or the market circle, a working farmer (it is these alone that ensure the land's survival), but intelligent, willing to come to grips with the arguments, uncorrupted, self-disciplined to a life above reproach
> (*Or.* 918-22, transl. M.L. West)

Here the Messenger's partiality — which does not affect the facts themselves, but only their presentation (cf. Willink's remark quoted in note 23) — is of a very open and explicit nature.[24] We will encounter more subtle variants later on.

The corporality of a first-person narrator entails, what Stanzel 1982: 12 terms an "Erzählmotivation", a reason to tell his story. In the case of the messenger of Greek tragedy, the most important motivation is of course an external one: the tradition that certain events were not shown

[23] Cf. Willink 224 ("we cannot but accept the facts reported by the ἄγγελος as correct; but we are not committed to the same acceptance of his subjective interpretation of the facts, coloured as it is by the declared prejudices of an elderly and politically naïve rustic loyal to the House of Agamemnon"). See also Erdmann 7 on the partiality of the messenger in general.

[24] For the function of this partiality, see note 118.

on stage but reported verbally (see Chapter 3). However, Euripides quite often provides his messenger with a text-internal motivation,[25] which the latter mentions in the introductory dialogue or at the end of his narrative. Some messengers come of their own accord, to warn their addressees, e.g.

> Μήδεια, φεῦγε φεῦγε, μήτε ναΐαν
> λιποῦσ' ἀπήνην μήτ' ὄχον πεδοστιβῆ.
>
> Medea, get away, escape, neither rejecting a wagon riding on sea nor one on ground.
>
> (*Med.* 1122-3)[26]

or to announce the arrival of others, e.g.

> ἔρχεται δὲ σοὶ
> κάρα 'πιδείξων, οὐχὶ Γοργόνος φέρων
> ἀλλ' ὃν στυγεῖς Αἴγισθον.
>
> And now he [Orestes] is coming, and brings to show you not the Gorgon's head, but the man you hate, Aegisthus.
>
> (*El.* 855-7, transl. M.J. Cropp)[27]

Orestes will enter the stage with Aegisthus' body in 880.
Other messengers come because they are sent by others, e.g.

> Μενέλαε, μαστεύων σε κιγχάνω μόλις
> πᾶσαν πλανηθεὶς τήνδε βάρβαρον χθόνα,
> πεμφθεὶς ἑταίρων τῶν λελειμμένων ὕπο.

[25] See Fischl 22-3.

[26] Other examples: *IT* 1409-10, *Ion* 1106-8, *Or.* 953-4, *Ba.* 664-7 + 769-74. Note that this last Messenger must first be assured by his addressee Pentheus that he will not be punished for his message (668-76). According to Roux 457, ad 668-9, "La prudence du serviteur est un trait stéréotype dans la tragédie". There is an even older precedent in *Iliad* 1.76-83 (Calchas vs. Agamemnon). There are more examples of messengers who, at first, hesitate to report their bad news: *Ph.* 1209-18, and cf. A. *A.* 636-49, S. *Ant.* 223-36.

[27] Other examples: *Heracl.* 862-3 (note that this Messenger gets a reward from his addressee: 789-90, 888-91), *Andr.* 1158-60, *Supp.* 761, *Ph.* 1476-7, *Ba.* 1144-7. This type of messenger is reminiscent of the τάχυς ἄγγελος Idaeus in Sappho *fr.* 44., who comes to announce the arrival of Hector and Andromache.

> Menelaus, finally I have found you while looking for you, having wandered all through this barbarian country, and being sent by the comrades you left behind.
>
> (*Hel.* 597-9)[28]

I conclude that the Euripidean messenger is firmly anchored in the play, taking two roles at a time: within his own narrative he is servant, soldier, sailor, etc., while on stage he is the messenger who reports to other characters the events he has witnessed. The first role influences the second, in that it entails involvement and engagement in the way the story is told. Thus we have now adduced a first set of examples to counter the objectivity claim.

2.3 The messenger as narrator

It is much less common for the messenger to refer to himself as "the one who speaks" than as "the one who sees".[29] The former function is obviously less in need of confirmation and authorization, since the spectators see and hear the messenger narrating throughout. Two of the sparse references to his narration are:

> Καπανεὺς δὲ πῶς <u>εἴποιμ'</u> ἂν ὡς ἐμαίνετο;
>
> As to Capaneus how could <u>I tell you</u> how mad he was?
>
> (*Ph.* 1172, transl. E. Craik)

and

> τἀκεῖ παρόντα πολλὰ πήματ' οὐκ ἔχω
τί πρῶτον <u>εἴπω</u>, πότερα τὴν ἐς οὐρανὸν
κόνιν προσαντέλλουσαν, ὡς πολλὴ παρῆν,
ἢ τοὺς ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω φορουμένους
ἱμᾶσιν, αἵματός τε φοινίου ῥοὰς ...
>
> of the many miseries to be seen there, I would not know which <u>to tell</u> first, of the dust rising up to heaven, how much there was of it, or of those being

[28] Other examples: *Hec.* 508-10, *IT* 334-5.

[29] See pp. 9-12 and Appendix B on the messenger as eyewitness.

borne along, up and down (entangled) in their reins, and the rivers of blood ...

(*Supp.* 686-90)[30]

Both these reflections by the messenger on his own narrating activity serve a clear function. In the case of *Ph.* 1172 he wishes to stress the enormity of Capaneus' hybristic behaviour. The question 'how could I describe' is not wholly a rhetorical one, since in the ensuing lines (1173-86) he proceeds (note γάρ) to give a lavish description of Capaneus' outrageous behaviour and Zeus' punishment of it.[31] In *Supp.* 686-90 the Messenger emphasizes through τί πρῶτον εἴπω the horror of the battle he is reporting.[32] As in *Ph.*, the question is not wholly rhetorical, since the ecphrasis which follows (687-93) gives a good impression of the πολλὰ πήματα.[33]

Thus we see that while in principle his visible presence on stage renders any reference to the messenger's narrating activity superfluous, such references may be made for a particular purpose.

2.4 The messenger as focalizer

In Chapter 1 I discussed the principal manifestation of the messenger as focalizer, viz. his status as eyewitness. While the messenger's role as character may range from one involving considerable activity to mere

[30] The other places are: *Heracl.* 847-8 (see p. 11), *Hec.* 519 (see pp. 30-1), *Or.* 1400 (the Messenger's remark is triggered by that of the Chorus' in 1393; note the repetition of αὖθ' ἕκαστα).

[31] See also p. 83 on μακραύχενος ... κλίμακος (1173) and pp. 91-92 on the comparison ὡς κύκλωμ' Ἰξίονος (1185).

[32] Similarly, the Messenger in A. *Pers.* 302-514 refers no fewer than three times (330, 429-30, 513-4) to his activity as narrator, stressing that the number of miseries is larger than he could describe.

[33] Collard 1975: 287, ad 684-7a, mentions as epic parallels for the τί πρῶτον εἴπω-question *Il.* 11.218ff. and *Od.* 9.14; of which I find the first less convincing (for a different interpretation, see De Jong 1987a: 49-51). Note that in *Od.* 9.14 the question is again not wholly rhetorical, since from 39 onwards Odysseus will recount his κήδεα; another parallel, *Od.* 3.113-9, contains a real rhetorical question, since Nestor does *not* proceed to tell the κακά of the ten years before Troy.

observation, his role as focalizer is constant;[34] even when he is invisible in the story, he remains the one "who sees". This is illustrated by the messenger-speech in *Alc.*, in which, as we saw above (p. 7), the Messenger is almost completely invisible. The following passage, however, clearly betrays her focalization:

> προσηύξατο,
>
> ...
>
> ἄκλαυτος ἀστένακτος, οὐδὲ τοὐπιὸν
> κακὸν μεθίστη χρωτὸς εὐειδῆ φύσιν.
>
> she [Alcestis] prayed without weeping or lamenting, and the nearness of death did not change the beauty of her face.
>
> (*Alc.* 171-4)

The negative form of the presentation reveals that the Messenger had herself expected Alcestis to weep, lament, and change colour. That she does not, greatly enhances her — and her addressees'? — admiration (cf. θαυμάσῃ: 157) for her mistress.[35]

In the remainder of this section I will discuss five categories of manifestations of the Euripidean messenger's focalization,[36] beginning with the more obvious ones and then turning to the more subtle ones.

(i) Concluding evaluation

The most explicit manifestation of the messenger's focalization — apart from the verbs of seeing and hearing — is the evaluation with which he concludes his story (σφραγίς, *coda*).[37] It is either specific, e.g.:

[34] For the purposes of this chapter it is not necessary to distinguish between experiencing and narrating focalization, as I did in Ch. 1.

[35] Similarly, in *Ba.* 755-8 the series of negatives (5 in 3 verses) gives expression to the Messenger's astonishment (cf. Dodds ad 755-7 and Roux 483, ad 757).

[36] I recall that focalization comprises not only seeing, but also interpreting, ordering, and evaluating.

[37] See Bassi 68-70, Fischl 38, Henning 27, Erdmann 82-6. A complete inventory is given in Appendix E. Cf. also A. *Pers.* 429-32; S. *Ant.* 1242-3, *Tr.* 808-12, 943-6, *OT* 1280-5.

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν
οὐκ οἶδα θνητῶν ὅστις ἀθλιώτερος.

I, for my part, do not know a more wretched mortal [sc. than Heracles].
(*HF* 1014-5)

or couched in the form of a general reflection (*sententia*), e.g.:

τῇ δὲ νῦν τύχῃ
βροτοῖς ἅπασι λαμπρὰ κηρύσσει μαθεῖν,
τὸν εὐτυχεῖν δοκοῦντα μὴ ζηλοῦν πρὶν ἂν
θανόντ' ἴδῃ τις· ὡς ἐφήμεροι τύχαι.

By his present fate he [Eurystheus] proclaims clearly to all mortals to know that we should envy none his seeming happiness till his last hour: fortune may vanish in one day.
(*Heracl.* 863-6)

Barlow 1971: 62 plays down the significance of the messenger's general evaluations, calling them "moral platitudes".[38] The messenger, however, is not the only one to utter *sententiae*: "Euripide met des réflexions générales sur tout dans la bouche de tous".[39] Thus, the maxim 'call no man happy before death' referred to in *Heracl.* 863-6 is also mentioned by Andromache (*Andr.* 100-2), Hecuba (*Tro.* 509-10), and Agamemnon (*IA* 161-2). Why should it be considered a moral platitude only in the case of the Messenger?[40]

[38] A similarly low opinion of them (and of conclusive reflections in general) is voiced by Friis Johansen 151-9, in particular 154: "more often than not the reflection is not much more than a final flourish of no particular importance". I do not see how this is compatible with his remark on 155: "It is easy to see, and not in the least surprising, that the conclusive reflections, when they occur at the end of a longer rhesis, have a clear preference for rheseis of primary importance in the play. The reflection adds weight to the main contents of the speech, and inversely, it gains weight itself from an important main subject."

[39] De Romilly 1984, 16.

[40] A defense of "tragic wisdom" in general is made by Heath 157-62, in particular 159: "Given that the purpose of tragedy is emotive, rather than intellectual, it is precisely from the traditional ideas and conventional ideas of the *polis* that the tragedians would be expected to draw the theological and moral structure of their dramatic worlds; for these ideas by their familiarity are readily comprehended, and so carry conviction to a high degree."

Other scholars have taken the opposite view, declaring the messenger the mouthpiece of the poet, e.g. in *Andr.* 1165 (πῶς ἂν οὖν εἴη σοφός; sc. Apollo).[41]

In my opinion, the messenger's concluding evaluations, whether specific or general, deserve to be taken seriously, just as seriously as the utterances of other characters, though certainly not more so. The best way to interpret these passages is not to isolate (and thereby enfeeble) them as 'bons mots', but to relate them to the play as a whole and to the evaluations voiced by other characters. Thus, in *HF* the Messenger's evaluation of Heracles as the most wretched of mortals (1014-5) sums up clearly the sudden change in Heracles' position from supreme and semi-divine hero to miserable mortal — an important theme in this play: see p. 129 —, and his opinion will shortly afterwards be shared by Amphitryon (1196-7) and Theseus (1195, 1216-7).[42] In *Alc.* the Messenger's opinion that Alcestis' sacrifice will come to be regretted by Admetus (197-8), though not at this stage shared by other characters, will come true in 935-61, in particular 935-40. To call this Messenger's evaluation "a bit of personal wisdom" (Dale *ad loc.*)[43] is, therefore, to miss the dramatic tension created by these prophetic words.

The end of his story is not the only place where the messenger airs his personal feelings, as we shall now see.

[41] Cf. Wecklein ("Wie 1063 kritisiert der Dichter das Unmoralische der Sage") and Stevens ("he may be the mouthpiece of the poet"); another instance is Erdmann 124, ad *Or.* (1).

[42] Similarly, *Ba.* 770-4 matches Teiresias' opinion in 274-83 (Dodds ad 769-74 and Winnington-Ingram 1948: 99) and that of Dionysus himself in 859-61 (Oranje 74, n. 181).

[43] Dale ad *Hel.* 1617-8 again underrates the significance of the Messenger's evaluation, calling it "a brief tag of popular wisdom". Contrast Kannicht: "Die vorliegende Sentenz ... enthält das Fabula-docet in dem Sinn, daß sie auf eine Formel bringt, was die μηχανή-Handlung gegen Theokl. im ganzen expliziert hat: die problematische Macht der λόγοι, zu überreden statt zu beweisen und zu täuschen statt aufzuklären und mit den Mitteln der täuschenden Überredung Schein als Wahrheit zu inszenieren."

(ii) Interspersed criticism and engagement

The messenger also gives expression to his emotions or opinions in the course of his storytelling. My first two examples deal with an explicit show of emotion:

> ἐγὼ δ' ἀνηλάλαξα κἀνωρχησάμην
> κἄκρουσα χεῖρας.
>
> and I started to yell, to dance and to clap my hands.
>
> (Supp. 719-20)

and

> ὁ δ'οὔτε τοὺς κλύοντας αἰδεσθεὶς λόγων
> οὔτ' αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ δειλίαν στρατηγὸς ὢν
> ἐλθεῖν ἐτόλμησ' ἐγγὺς ἀλκίμου δορός,
> ἀλλ' ἦν κάκιστος· εἶτα τοιοῦτος γεγὼς
> τοὺς Ἡρακλείους ἦλθε δουλώσων γόνους;
>
> but he [Eurystheus], neither respecting those who had heard the proposal nor feeling shame about his own cowardice as a general, did not dare come near his [Hyllus'] spear, but was most cowardly: being such a man, he came to enslave Heracles' offspring?
>
> (*Heracl.* 813-7)[44]

Passages like these do not merely "enliven the account" (Collard 1975: 295, ad *Supp.* 719-20a)[45] or serve to structure it (Erdmann 86), but bring to the fore the role of the messenger as mediator, as emotional filter. He is not a journalist, who watches events 'professionally' with an eye to making a good story out of them; he watches because he is present at, and often actively involved in the events.

Next, there are the many instances of τλήμων, τάλαινα and the like. Barlow 1971: 62, again plays down their significance: "words which are so commonplace that they do not distract the listener as more subtly reactive comments would". I believe, however, that their effect should

[44] Other examples: *Hipp.* 1204-5, *HF* 950-2, *Ph.* 1388-9. See Bassi 66-7, Henning 23-7, Fischl 41.

[45] Cf. also Bond ad *HF* 950-2: "Servants' reactions are often used by Euripides to give depth to his messengers' narrative."

not be underestimated, in particular when they occur with some frequency within one and the same story, as in *Med.* (1184, 1189, 1218), *HF* (973, 986, 996, 1013), or *Ba.* (2) (1058,[46] 1102, 1117, 1126).

But a pathetic effect can also be achieved by less explicit means, in the Homeric manner. The following passage is an example of the 'bereaved parents' motif, of which Griffin 108-9 has so convincingly shown with regard to the *Iliad* that it conveys pathos without the use of "explicitly emotional words":

οὐδ' ἀποίσεται βίον
τῇ καλλιτόξῳ μητρὶ Μαινάλου κόρῃ.

He [Parthenopaeus] will not take back his life to his mother, the dweller on Maenalus with fine bow.

(*Ph.* 1161-2, transl. E. Craik)[47]

The use of this motif is particularly apt in the case of Parthenopaeus, since his whole personality is so closely bound up with that of his mother (cf. 150-3 and 1106-9).

As regards the explicit expression of his personal opinion, the messenger does not hesitate to call one man brave (*Heracl.* 812: εὐψυχίαν, *El.* 845: ἀνδρείας), and another a coward (*Heracl.* 816: κάκιστος); one god-fearing (*IT* 268: θεοσεβής), and another irreverent and lawless (*IT* 275: μάταιος, ἀνομίᾳ θρασύς). He leaves no doubt as to who the 'bad guy' of the story is (*Andr.* 1116: μηχανορράφος; *Or.* 1403: κακόμητις ἀνήρ, 1447: κακὸς Φωκεύς) and who its hero (*Andr.* 1123: γοργὸς ὁπλίτης ἰδεῖν,[48] 1146: φαεννοῖς δεσπότης στίλβων ὅπλοις); who is right (*Or.* 918-22) and who is wrong (*Or.* 889-97, 903-13; *Ba.* 686: οὐχ ὡς σὺ φῄς); who is to blame (*Hel.* 1552-3: πάντα

[46] Discussed above pp. 48-9.

[47] Cf. e.g. *Iliad* 17.300-3. Note also the 'beauty brought low' motif in the immediately preceding lines (discussed on pp. 81-2).

[48] Cf. Stevens *ad loc.*: "it is more likely that γοργός means 'terrible' and that Eur. now uses, *to express the messenger's admiration of N.*, the same phrase that had been used sarcastically of Menelaus in 458" (my italics).

συνέχεας τάδε) and who deserves praise (*Supp.* 707: τὸν στρατηγὸν αἰνέσαι παρῆν).[49]

Sometimes a messenger tries to give his own subjectivity the air of objectivity:

> ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔπειθ' ὅμιλον, εὖ δοκῶν λέγειν.
>
> but he [Orestes] was not persuading the crowd, good though his speech seemed.
>
> (*Or.* 943, transl. M.L. West)

The Messenger is in fact speaking for himself (Willink *ad loc.*) or at least for some (West *ad loc.*), sc. the χρηστοῖς of 930, only.

The following passage illustrates how a messenger can make clear his own opinion through his presentation alone, without making an explicit and separately formulated comment:

> χὼ μὲν κατ' ὄμμα στὰς προσεύχεται θεῷ,
> οἱ δ' ὀξυθήκτοις φασγάνοις ὡπλισμένοι
> κεντοῦσ' ἀτευχῆ παῖδ' Ἀχιλλέως λάθρᾳ.
>
> And he [Neoptolemus] standing in full sight of all, prays to the god, but they [Delphians], armed with sharp-pointed swords, unawares stab the unarmed son of Achilles.
>
> (*Andr.* 1117-9)

The Messenger condemns the attack on his master Neoptolemus as a low and treacherous deed, through the contrast between κατ' ὄμμα and λάθρᾳ[50] and between ὀξυθήκτοις φασγάνοις ὡπλισμένοι and ἀτευχῆ. The epithet ὀξυθήκτοις further 'sharpens' the "contrast with the unsuspecting and unprotected victim" (Stevens *ad loc.*). There are similar cases where the use of a particular epithet is a subtle manifestation of the messenger's focalization, as we shall now see.

[49] And cf. *Ph.* 1219-20 (regarding both Eteocles and Polyneices): τολμήματα αἴσχιστα. Note that the Messenger's disapproval differs from the feelings of Eteocles' and Polyneices' friends, who encourage them, because they believe they are each fighting for a just cause (1250-1, note εὐκλεᾶ ... λόγον, and 1252-3, note καλλίνικος), cf. Müller-Goldingen 194.

[50] Cf. Stevens ad 1117.

(iii) Epithets

Thus far scholars have looked at the epithets in the Euripidean messenger-speech primarily in relation to the question of the epic colouring ("Episierung") of this type of text. Fischl 41-3 concludes that as far as the epithets are concerned, there is no such epic colouring, since the messenger-speeches contain few ornamental epithets, and it is only these which he considers epic. Fischl's conclusion was further confirmed by the extensive investigations of Bergson, who contends (184-5) that when ornamental epithets occur with some frequency in the messenger-speech — he found more of them than Fischl — this is due to the narrative nature of this text type, rather than to conscious epic imitation: "le mode de présentation ... est tel que le poète a le temps d'étoffer son récit de mots ornementaux superflus".[51]

In the following discussion of epithets in messenger-speeches, I will not distinguish between ornamental and significant epithets,[52] since in my opinion this distinction is often very difficult to make when we are dealing with texts other than the Homeric epics. It is also less relevant for my present purpose, which is to analyze epithets in connection with the messenger's focalization. One example will serve to illustrate this second point: Fischl 42 considers κυμοδέγμονος in Hipp. 1173 an ornamental epithet. Now it is true that most shores could be called 'wave receiving', and thus the epithet might be considered 'superfluous' or ornamental. However, as I have argued above (p. 47), the use of this epithet — a *hapax*! — is highly significant from a narrative point of view: it is this aspect of the shore which lingers in the Messenger's mind and which he mentions in anticipation of the events he will later recount.[53]

[51] Both Erdmann 74-6 and Kannicht 399, n. 2 confine their discussion of epithets to an — approving — summary of Bergson.

[52] The term 'significant epithets' (epitheta significantia) derives from Fischl 42. Bergson 17-8 distinguishes between 1) épithète déterminative, 2) é. qualificative/affective, and 3) é. ornementale. Following Bergson 11, I consider all adjectives which are used attributively as epithets.

[53] Similarly, Bergson considers e.g. ὀξυθήκτοις in *Andr.* 1118 ornamental (comparing θηκτὸν φάσγανον/ξίφος in *Med.* 379 and *Ion* 1064), without considering its appropriateness in the context of the treacherous attack on the unarmed Neoptolemus (p. 79). We will see below (p. 84) that even epithets which

I will start with an example of an epithet which explicitly expresses the messenger's emotions:

χωρεῖ δὲ θήρᾳ δυσπότμῳ γαυρουμένη
τειχέων ἔσω τῶνδ'

She [Agave] passes, rejoicing in her ill-fated spoils, within these walls
(*Ba.* 1144-5, transl. G.S. Kirk)[54]

While Agave, ignorant of the true identity of her prey, is jubilant, the Messenger, who knows it to be Pentheus, expresses through δυσπότμῳ his pity for him and, I think, for her.[55] My next example shows the use of an epithet to convey implicitly the emotions of the messenger:

ξύλον καθῆκε παιδὸς ἐς ξανθὸν κάρα

he [Heracles] let his wooden club come down on the blond head of his son
(*HF* 993)

The addition of a detail like 'blond' heightens the pathos of this passage.[56] Comparable to this type of passage is that in which an

in the Homeric epics are ornamental can be used in the messenger-speech for special purposes.

[54] Other examples: *Hipp.* 1177 (τλήμονας φυγάς), 1247 (δύστηνον τέρας); *Hec.* 562 (τλημονέστατον λόγον); *HF* 991 (λυγροῦ τοξεύματος, according to Bergson 92 ornamental); *Ph.* 1420 (λυγρῷ πεσήματι), 1454 (ἄθλιον βίον); *Ba.* 1100 (στόχον δύστηνον), 1139 (κρᾶτα ... ἄθλιον).

[55] For the Messenger pitying Agave, see 1117 (τλήμων 'Αγαύη; strictly speaking Pentheus is focalizing here; cf. Roux ad 1115-8: "La pitié du serviteur va également à tous les membres de la famille") and 1147 (δάκρυα νικηφορεῖ). He is aware that she is deluded and is acting under the influence of the god (cf. e.g. 1123-4).

[56] Cf. ξανθὸν ... κρᾶτα (*Ph.* 1159). In *Med.* 1141 ξανθὸν κάρα in the first place gives expression to the affection of the servants (among them the Messenger), but there is also a pathetic undertone in view of what the spectators know lies ahead of the children. Other examples: *Med.* 1189 (λευκὴν ... σάρκα, cf. von Arnim and Wecklein: "das Epitheton ... hebt das Mitleiderregende des Anblickes hervor". Even if female flesh is always called 'white', the standard epithet has a function here in recalling the princess's delicate femininity at the moment of its destruction), 1212 (γεραιὸν ... δέμας), 1217 (σάρκας γεραιάς); *Ph.* 1443 (γραῖαν ... μητέρ'). The pathos of *HF* 925 (χορὸς ... καλλίμορφος) lies in the contrast with the horrible things which await this 'shapely chorus' (see also χορεύσω in 871).

epithet evokes the 'beauty brought low' motif. Griffin 134-8 demonstrated the pathetic undertones of this motif in the *Iliad*, e.g. in:

κάρη δ' ἅπαν ἐν κονίῃσι
κεῖτο πάρος χαρίεν

and all his [Hector] head which used to be so graceful lay in the dust
(*Il.* 22.402-3)

A similar example from a messenger-speech is:

πᾶν δ' ἀνήλωται δέμας
τὸ καλλίμορφον τραυμάτων ὕπ' ἀγρίων.

and his [Neoptolemus] whole shapely body was deformed by savage wounds.
(*Andr.* 1154-5)[57]

In the examples discussed so far the emotion expressed by the epithet was compassion. Epithets may also voice other emotions. Thus the Messenger of *Andr.* uses them no fewer than four times to express his indignation at the abuse of the holy place of Delphi for a base murder. The first time is in his opening sentence: ἐπεὶ τὸ κλεινὸν ἤλθομεν Φοίβου πέδον ('after we had come to the famous ground of Phoebus': 1085), a passage which I discussed above (p. 47). The second instance is:

βωμοῦ κενώσας δεξίμηλον ἐσχάραν, ...
χωρεῖ πρὸς αὐτούς

having abandoned the altar's sheep receiving fireplace, ... he [Neoptolemus] bursts upon them
(*Andr.* 1138-40)

The epithet δεξίμηλον indicates the normal function of the altar, viz. to receive animal sacrifices — and it was precisely to make such a sacrifice that Neoptolemus had come (1100-3) — and by implication calls attention to the unholy things now taking place on and near this

[57] Other examples: *Med.* 1198 (εὐφυὲς πρόσωπον), *Ph.* 1160 (ἄρτι ... οἰνωπὸν γένυν, on which Craik comments: "The realistic description of the ugly and violent death of Parthenopaios is heightened by a reminder of his boyish good looks").

altar. The same effect seems intended by θυοδόκων ἀνακτόρων 'the incense receiving temple') in 1157. The fourth and most emphatic instance is:

> κραυγὴ δ' ἐν εὐφήμοισι δύσφημος δόμοις
> πέτραισιν ἀντέκλαγξ'
>
> and an unholy shouting coming from within the holy house echoed against the rocks
>
> (*Andr.* 1144-5)

Here the juxtaposition of the two antonymous epithets strengthens the effect of δύσφημος as the expression of the Messenger's (indignant) focalization. Following these hints, the Messenger's feelings are fully expressed in his concluding evaluation (1161-5), in which he indicts the god of Delphi himself: not only Delphi and the Delphians, but also Apollo has betrayed his reputation.[58]

An epithet is also used to express criticism in the following passage:

> Καπανεὺς δὲ πῶς εἴποιμ' ἂν ὡς ἐμαίνετο;
> μακραύχενος γὰρ κλίμακος προσαμβάσεις
> ἔχων ἐχώρει
>
> As to Capaneus how could I tell you how mad he was? A long-necked ladder's scaling reach in his grasp, he went on
>
> (*Ph.* 1172-4)

The epithet μακραύχενος is a *hapax* in Euripides and in the whole of Greek literature this is the only instance in which it is used of a ladder.[59] It seems to have been chosen by the Messenger in order to

[58] I disagree with Burnett 1971: 152, who places the blame on Neoptolemus: "In his most superb moment the hero [Neopt.] unwittingly gives truth to Orestes' slander, actually 'sacking' Apollo's shrine (...), seizing the arms that had been dedicated to the god and using them in a battle with Apollo's priests. He sweeps the sacred objects from the altar [sic] and takes his stand upon it ... and in the ensuing rout ... he [sic] fills the peaceful shrine with a rowdy ill-omened din."

[59] Both μακραύχην and δολιχαύχην are used of birds.

point out once more the self-assuredness of the ladder's owner, Capaneus.[60]

If we concur with Kvi¢ala in reading ὁ καινὸς ... ἄναξ in *El.* 776, instead of L's κλεινός, then this is another instance of an epithet expressing implied criticism: Aegisthus marked as the usurper of Agamemnon's throne. I would tend to favour this reading, since it prepares us for Orestes' ironic references to Aegisthus' position as ἄναξ in 796 and 834-5.

Epithets may also reveal a messenger's incredulity at the enormity of the events he is watching. Thus commentators have duly noted that the epithets in *Hipp.* 1223 (στόμια πυριγενῆ), 1225 (κολλητῶν ὄχων), and 1245 (τμητῶν ἱμάντων) are epic and ornamental. Actually, the Messenger seems to be using these epithets for the same reason as when he emphasizes Hippolytus' expertise in handling horses (1219-20: ἱππικοῖσιν ἤθεσιν πολὺς ξυνοικῶν),[61] viz. to indicate his dismay at seeing what is taking place: Hippolytus being beaten with his own weapons.[62] The bits, though hardened in fire, cannot control the horses (1224-6); the chariot, though tightly constructed,[63] falls apart (1234-5); the leather thongs, though artfully cut, become their possessor's deadly chains (δεσμόν, δεσμῶν: 1237, 1244).

The messenger may use epithets to give expression to his own feelings, but he may also choose them with an eye to his addressees and their response to his story. Thus epithets can draw attention to or

[60] In Philostratus' *VA* 7.23 we find the expression τὸν αὐχένα ἱστάναι for 'to be high-spirited'. Capaneus' hybristic self-confidence was proverbial (see Kurtz 433, ad *Supp.* 726-30). The piquancy of the *Supp.* passage (noted neither by Kurtz nor by Collard) is that the Messenger here is himself a servant of Capaneus (639-40), and through the imagery of 729 (ἐς ἄκρα βῆναι κλιμάκων ἐνήλατα) is implicitly critizing his master (just as he critizes Adrastus in 644-6). The Theban herald explicitly sneered at Capaneus' arrogance in 496-9.

[61] See also the imagery of captain (ναυκλήρου χερός) in 1224 and helmsman (ἔχων οἴακας) in 1227, which seems to have been triggered by the comparison ὥστε ναυβάτης ἀνήρ in 1221.

[62] Cf. Heath 157: "[Hippolytus] is the hero of the story, the one who is admirably competent, and who would — if anyone could — be in control; but he is not, a discrepancy which enhances the pitiable helplessness of the innocent victim in the face of a terrifying, and terrifyingly inexorable, supernatural power".

[63] Cf. Barrett on κολλητῶν (ad 1224-6): "a purely ornamental epithet, borrowed from epic, ... In epic it presumably indicates strength of construction".

emphasize aspects of things which are of special relevance in the story. Two examples will serve to illustrate this:

καὶ δι' εὐθυντηρίας
οἴακας ἐξῃροῦμεν εὐπρύμνου νεώς.

and we tried to haul the rudder-oars through the fastening hole of the ship with goodly stem.

(*IT* 1356-7)

Bergson 77 considers εὐπρύμνου ornamental (comparing *Il.* 4.248 and Bacchylides 13.150). However, the entire scene of Iphigeneia's embarkment is situated at the stern of the Greek ship (cf. πρύμνηθεν: 1349, πρύμνης: 1352, 1377, πρυμνησίων: 1356), and in chosing this particular epithet the Messenger once more draws attention to this part of the ship. When in 1383 Iphigeneia has finally managed to get aboard, that same ship is aptly given the epithet εὐσέλμου, 'with good rowing benches' (Pierson's reading of L's εὐσήμου), since now the moment of rowing has arrived (1387-91).

The second example is:

ἀνδρείας δ' ὕπο
ἔστησαν ἀντίπρῳρα σείοντες βέλη
Πυλάδης Ὀρέστης τ'.

but spurred by courage they stood their ground, brandishing their javelins point forward, Pylades and Orestes.

(*El.* 845-7)

The epithet ἀντίπρῳρα (literally of ships turning their prow towards the enemy, ready to attack) underscores Pylades' and Orestes' readiness to fight, and to face even a superior force. It thereby substantiates the Messenger's admiring comment ἀνδρείας ... ὕπο.[64]

[64] Other examples: *Med.* 1161 (λαμπρῷ κατόπτρῳ, emphasizes the princess's bright mood), 1187 (παμφάγου πυρός: this epithet is only here used of fire, it aligns with ἔδαπτον in 1189 and γνάθοις in 1201); *Hipp.* 1205-6 (ἁλιρρόθους ἀκτάς: cf. ἔνθεν ... κλύειν: 1201-2), 1237 (δεσμὸν δυσεξέλικτον: cf. ἡνίαισιν ἐμπλακείς in 1236 and note the alliteration of δ in 1237); *IT* 323 (δίπαλτα ... ξίφη, motivates the herdsmen's flight in 324), *Hel.* 1531 (ναῦν πρωτόπλουν: stresses Theoclymenus' generosity. Less convincingly Kannicht 402, ad 1530-6:

Epithets can also be used to increase tension, as in:

> φαρέτραν δ' <u>εὐτρεπῆ</u> σκευάζεται
> καὶ τόξ' ἑαυτοῦ παισί
>
> and he [Heracles] prepares his <u>ready</u> quiver and bow against his own children
>
> (*HF* 969-70)

Heracles is about to use his 'ready' bow, which so far has never failed him in his confrontations with formidable opponents — Centaurs: 364-7, Cycnus: 389-91, inhabitants of Oechalia: 472-3 — against his own children.[65]

Finally, the effect of an epithet may be that of a close-up, as in:

> θνῄσκει δ' ἀπασπαίρουσα, <u>φοινικοσκελεῖς</u>
> χηλὰς παρεῖσα.
>
> and it [pigeon] dies convulsing, relaxing its <u>red-toed</u> claws.
>
> (*Ion* 1207-8)[66]

The attention of all the revellers is concentrated on the dying bird (ἐθάμβησεν δὲ πᾶς θοινατόρων ὅμιλος: 1205-6), and whereas in the verses leading up to this climax the unobtrusive epithet εὔπτερος (1200,

"offensichtlich eine beziehungsvolle Anspielung auf Hom. θ 34-5 ...: wie das Schiff der Phäaken auf seine Jungfernfahrt geht, um Odysseus nach Ithaka zu bringen, so wird (das sollen die Zuschauer realisieren) die ναῦς Σιδωνία des Theokl. auf ihre Jungfernfahrt gehen, um Hel. und Men. nach Griechenland zu bringen").

[65] Other examples: *El.* 819 (εὐκρότητον Δωρίδ'), *Ion* 1184 (πλῆρες τεῦχος).

[66] Other examples: *Med.* 1164 (παλλεύκῳ ποδί, cf. Elliott *ad loc.*: "Euripides uses only a few descriptive adjectives in this narrative and then at points at which a clever cameraman would bring out a detail in close-up in a film"); *HF* 934 (εὔτριχος γενειάδος); *IT* 312 (εὐπήνους ὑφάς, cf. Wecklein *ad loc.*: "Die Angabe ε. ὑ. ist nicht müssig, weil gerade das feine und kunstvolle Gewand den mit Steinen darauf zielenden Hirten in die Augen fallen mußte"); *Hel.* 1570 (εὐσφύρου ποδός); *Or.* 1457 (ἀμφιπορφυρέων πέπλων), 1468 (χρυσεοσάνδαλον ἴχνος).

1203) was used, through the *hapax* φοινικοσκελεῖς[67] the Messenger now picks out an arresting visual detail.[68]

Thus, in conclusion, epithets may be employed effectively by the messenger for narrative purposes, in order to express his own feelings or to influence the response of his addressees.

(iv) Comparisons

As in the case of the epithets, scholars of the Euripidean messenger-speech have examined the comparisons mainly with a view to the question of epic imitation ("Episierung"). Their unanimous conclusion is that the comparisons in the messenger-speech in no way are comparable to their Homeric predecessors, being fewer and shorter.[69] While Bassi, Fischl, and Henning leave it at that, Erdmann undertakes to attribute to the comparison its own functions, which are, in his view, to bring "Anschaulichkeit" and "Bedeutungsverdichtung" (78). In particular, comparisons visualize and emphasize "das Unerwartete oder Plötzliche, das Ungewöhnliche und Sensationelle":

> Die Ohnmacht der Königstochter wird dem Hörer unheimlich (Med. 1181ff.), das Eintreten der Fluch-Katastrophe (Hipp. 1201) schauerlich; Unentrinnbarkeit wirkt lähmend (Med. 1213), rasches Tempo gefährlich (El. 824f.; Ba. 746f.; 1090f.), menschliche Wildheit tierisch (IT 297; Ph. 1380-1 (vgl. Or. 1459f.), Ba. 748), kreatürliche Angst erschütternd (HF 974), elementare Gewalt gefährlich (Ph. 1154; 1377).

Accepting Erdmann's analysis, Kurtz 302-4 adds that the comparisons have a structuring ("gliedernde") function; they either mark a new phase in the story (e.g. *Med.* 1213, where προσείχεθ', Creon being entangled in his daughter's arms, is the new dramatic development), or direct attention towards one of two contrasting parties (e.g. the Delphians in *Andr.* 1140-1). According to Barlow 1971: 109-10, the similes of the messenger-speech "contribute sharpness" to the "pictorial presentation"

[67] At the same time this epithet seems to refer back to an earlier scene (154-83), in which Ion chased birds away from Apollo's temple (οὐκ ἄλλᾳ φοινικοφαῆ πόδα κινήσεις;: 162-3), birds which now save his life!

[68] Cf. Barlow 1971: 63-4.

[69] See Bassi 89, Fischl 43-5, Henning 38-40, Erdmann 76-8. For an inventory of comparisons, see Appendix F.

which in general characterizes these texts, and are another manifestation of Euripides' "inclination towards pictorial visualization". She discusses *Ba.* 1066-9, where

> the feeling for shape in the attention to detail which emerges in the circular tracing of the wheel is similar to the precision of description outside the simile, when the messenger describes the straightening of the branch for instance, or when he describes the hurling of branches from a particular rock. The general uniformity of style is not broken by this simile. One action is merely made more imaginable by the precise visual conjuring of another.

In my opinion, the treatment of the comparisons in Euripidean messenger-speeches has not been exhausted by the analyses (in terms of emphasis, structure and visualization) of these three scholars.[70] Indeed, the interpretation of not a few of them can be sharpened or even corrected by analyzing them in connection with the focalization of the messenger or that of some other character. My first example is:

οἱ δ' ὅπως πελειάδες
ἱέρακ' ἰδοῦσαι πρὸς φυγὴν ἐνώτισαν.

and they [Delphians] turned their back and fled like doves seeing a hawk.
(*Andr.* 1140-1)

The comparison is primarily intended to indicate the speed with which the Delphians fled before Neoptolemus (for the speed of doves, see *Ba.* 1090). At the same time, by casting the Delphians in the role of doves the Messenger makes clear his contempt for them: though in the majority, they turn to flight when Neoptolemus approaches them. He never explicitly refers to them as cowards, but the comparison brands them as such. Conversely, comparing Neoptolemus to a hawk stresses his heroic stature.

In the passage:

μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος
κάλλιστα

[70] In fact, Kurtz' theory of the structuring function of comparisons has failed to convince me. In *Andr.* 1140-1, for example, the comparison refers to both parties (hawk=Neoptolemus; doves=Delphians), instead of directing attention towards one of the two, as he suggests.

and she [Polyxena] showed her breasts and bosom as beautiful as a statue's
(*Hec.* 560-1)

Polyxena's uncovering of the upper part of her body is a symbolic act, meant to illustrate her readiness to die (see pp. 142-3). The symbolism of her act seems lost on Talthybius (see p. 28). He cannot fail to notice the beauty of her young body,[71] not because he is a lecherous old man, but because her beauty increases his pity for the young girl who must die.[72] The comparison therefore enhances this already very pathetic passage. Here, too, Griffin's analysis of Iliadic pathos springs to mind, in particular his discussion of the Iliadic comparison καππεσέτην ἐλάτῃσιν ἐοικότες ὑψηλῇσιν (5.560): "Again, no word of explicit pathos; but the scholiast observes: 'expressed emotionally, through the tall pine-trees, because of their youth and beauty'" (105). Another instance of a pathetic comparison is:

ἄλλος δὲ βωμὸν ὄρνις ὣς ἔπτηξ' ὕπο.

yet another [of Heracles' sons] crouched low like a bird under the altar.
(*HF* 974)

The boy tries to make himself as small as a bird and thus escape his father's notice (and arrows), but to no avail, as will soon be clear (984-94). The imagery of the bird, as employed here by the Messenger, recalls that used earlier by Megara (71-2: Ἡράκλειοι παῖδες, οὓς ὑπὸ πτεροῖς σῴζω νεοσσοὺς ὄρνις ὣς ὑφειμένους) and Amphitryon (224: ἣν χρῆν νεοσσοῖς τοῖσδε πῦρ λόγχας ὅπλα φέρουσαν ἐλθεῖν); coming from Heracles himself (982: νεοσσὸς ὅδε), it will acquire a "grotesque and horrifying" meaning.[73]

[71] Cf. Kurtz 416: [Der Vergleich] "ist ganz auf die Schönheit abgestimmt, und zwar auf die Schönheit des menschlichen Körpers, wie sie die reife Kunst der Klassik darzustellen vermag". He compares Eur. *fr.* 125 (Nauck): [ὁρῶ] παρθένου τ' εἰκώ τινα ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαίνων τυκισμάτων σοφῆς ἄγαλμα χειρός. Weil compares Pl. *Charmides* 154C.

[72] Both Gellie 1980: 34 and Michelini 160-1 suggest that there is an erotic undercurrent at work in this scene.

[73] Bond ad *HF* 982. Heracles' use of this imagery strengthens the effect of dramatic irony (see p. 169). For the pathos of the νεοσσός-imagery, cf. *Tro.* 751 and Kurtz 319.

In the passage:

ὁ δὲ χερὶ σπάσας ξίφος,
μόσχους ὀρούσας ἐς μέσας λέων ὅπως,
παίει σιδήρῳ λαγόνας

and he drawing his sword with his hand and jumping amidst the calves like a lion, hits their flanks with the iron

(*IT* 296-8)

the comparison indicates how at that moment the Messenger and his fellow herdsmen view the stranger, viz. as a bloodthirsty lion destroying their herd.[74] The comparison explains the change from the herdsmen's inactivity (295-6: ἡμεῖς ... σιγῇ καθήμεθ') to activity (301-3: πᾶς τις ... ἐξωπλίζετο). Similarly, in the following two passages the comparisons reflect the Phrygian Messenger's frightened focalization of the aggressors Orestes and Pylades:

ὡς κάπροι δ' ὀρέστεροι γυ-
ναικὸς ἀντίοι σταθέντες
ἐννέπουσι

like mountain boars they stood facing the woman, and said

(*Or.* 1459-61, transl. M.L. West)

This is the moment when Orestes and Pylades drop their masks, revealing to Helen their murderous intentions, and the Phrygians' worst fears (cf. 1418-24) come true.[75]

ἔναντα δ' ἦλθε Πυλάδης
ἀλίαστος, οἷος οἷος Ἕκ-
τωρ ὁ Φρύγιος ἢ τρικόρυθος Αἴας,
ὃν εἶδον εἶδον ἐν πύλαις
Πριαμίσι

[74] This seems to be a more concrete interpretation than that of Erdmann 78 ("menschliche Wildheit wirkt tierisch").

[75] Cf. Willink ("Or. and Pyl. are at once aggressive hunters and like wild beasts at bay") and Kurtz 322 ("Der Vergleich wirkt, vom Bildthema her betrachtet, zunächst grotesk, weil die beide Männer vor einer wehrlosen Frau stehen und es gar nichts zu kämpfen gibt. Er läßt dann aber Orest und Pylades als besonders grauenerregend und martialisch erscheinen").

But against us came Pylades unflinching just like, like Hector the Phrygian, or triple-helmed Ajax, who I saw, I saw at Priam's gates.

(*Or.* 1478-81)

The Phrygians come forward to confront Pylades (and Orestes), and in this pseudo battle the use of a warrior comparison, rather than another animal comparison, is particularly apt. Earlier in his narrative the Messenger had also drawn on his wartime experience — which, as we know from 1381-9, is still a living memory — in order to stamp Pylades as a sneaky conspirator, 'like Odysseus' (οἷος Ὀδυσσεύς: 1404).[76]

In the passage:

θᾶσσον δὲ βύρσαν ἐξέδειρεν ἢ δρομεὺς
δισσοὺς διαύλους ἱππίους διήνυσεν

the hide he skinned off quicker than a runner completes two horse-track laps

(*El.* 824-5, transl. M.J. Cropp)

the comparison emphasizes Orestes' speed, and allows the Messenger to express his admiration for his master, who handles the dangerous situation of venturing into the lion's (Aegisthus') den so well.[77] After all, Orestes must pretend to be a Thessalian, an expert in slaughtering bulls (815-8). In the same way, the comparison in *Hipp.* 1186 (θᾶσσον ἢ λέγοι τις) stresses the loyalty of Hippolytus' friends and servants, which "shows him [Hippolytus] in a flattering light and attracts sympathy and admiration".[78]

A particularly subtle use of the narrative technique of the comparison is made by the Messenger of *Ph.* (1) and (2), who in 1185 compares the way in which Capaneus — or rather parts of his body — tumble down from the ladder, with Ixion's wheel (ὡς κύκλωμ' Ἰξίονος). As is clear

[76] Cf. West ad 1402. Of course, Odysseus has in general a bad reputation in Euripides (see Stanford 1963: 111-7).

[77] The choice of this particular imagery is also significant; Arnott 1981: 187-9 has drawn attention to the sustained imagery devoted to Orestes as victor in athletic games (614, 761-2, 781-2, 854, 862-3, 872, 880-9), imagery which represents the distorted 'heroic' view which Electra, Orestes (and the Messenger) have of their actions.

[78] Heath 156. He points out that the theme of loyalty recurs in 1195-6 and (in a dramatic climax) in 1243-4.

from other indications (see pp. 72-3), the Messenger condemns Capaneus' hybristic behaviour and, comparing him to a notorious criminal, subtly brings home this point.[79]

In the passage:

> ἔνθεν τις ἠχὼ χθόνιος, ὡς βροντὴ Διός,
> βαρὺν βρόμον μεθῆκε
>
> and then some sort of rumbling of the earth, like Zeus' thunder, sent forth a deep roaring
>
> (*Hipp.* 1201-2)

the comparison should be seen in the light of the Messenger's restricted understanding (see pp. 14-5). He cannot as yet identify the rumbling he hears. Is it an earthquake or Zeus' thunder or where does it come from (1205: πόθεν ποτ' εἴη φθόγγος)?[80] The fact that the Messenger thinks of Zeus' thunder may have been triggered by Hippolytus' self-curse in 1191: Ζεῦ, μηκέτ' εἴην εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ.

A somewhat more complicated case is

> Ὑσιάς τ' Ἐρυθράς θ', ...
> ὥστε πολέμιοι,
> ἐπεσπεσοῦσαι πάντ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω
> διέφερον
>
> and on Hysiae and Erythrae, ..., like enemies they fell, and turned everything upside down
>
> (*Ba.* 751-4, transl. G.S. Kirk)

Why does the Messenger use this imagery? For Winnington-Ingram 97 and Roux the answer is clear: the Messenger describes the assault of the Maenads as an act of hostility against the civilized world. However, this interpretation is not in accordance with the drift of the messenger-speech as a whole, which is intended to persuade Pentheus to *accept* Dionysus

[79] Müller-Goldingen 184, in my opinion, rightly defends 1183-5, or at least 1183 + 1185.

[80] To see this comparison as signalling "das Eintreten der Fluch-Katastrophe", as Erdmann 78 does, is certainly wrong, since 1) at this stage the Messenger does not yet know about the curse, and 2) one would then expect Poseidon to be mentioned rather than Zeus.

and maenadism (see p. 107). I would therefore suggest that ὥστε πολέμιοι should be interpreted as an expression of the Messenger's amazement at seeing these women assume a male role, that of warriors who attack and pillage a city.[81] This theme of role reversal becomes explicit in 763-4: κἀπενώτιζον φυγῇ γυναῖκες ἄνδρας and is picked up by Pentheus in 785-6: οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ὑπερβάλλει τάδε, εἰ πρὸς γυναικῶν πεισόμεσθ' ἃ πάσχομεν.[82]

Sometimes the comparison is less a comparison than a description of reality. Thus in

> χωροῦσι δ' ὥστ' ὄρνιθες ἀρθεῖσαι δρόμῳ
> πεδίων ὑποτάσεις
>
> The women move like birds lifted by their flight over the plains stretched out below
>
> (*Ba.* 748-9, transl. G.S. Kirk)

the Maenads actually seem to be flying:

> Bien qu'il soit banal en poésie de comparer des personnages qui se déplacent rapidement à des oiseaux ..., il ne s'agit pas ici d'une simple figure de style, mais d'un nouveau miracle. Les bacchantes, emportées dans leur course frénétique <<décollent>> du sol, échappant momentanément aux lois de la pesanteur ... Ce phénomène de lévitation, cette faculté qu'ont les bacchantes de se déplacer sans toucher terre est une manifestation caractéristique de l'enthousiasme bien attestée dans l'antiquité.[83]

The most dramatic example of this type of 'true' comparison is

> κρᾶτα δ' ἄθλιον,
> ὅπερ λαβοῦσα τυγχάνει μήτηρ χεροῖν,
> πήξασ' ἐπ' ἄκρον θύρσον ὡς ὀρεστέρου
> φέρει λέοντος

[81] A similar interpretation might be given to the manuscript reading πολεμίων δίκην in *Hec.* 1162: to Polymestor, Hecuba and her attendants, by drawing swords, are starting to behave like men.

[82] In a way, the Messenger's imagery is triggered by Agave's words in 733: ἕπεσθε θύρσοις διὰ χερῶν ὡπλισμέναι. For sex-reversals in *Ba.*, see Segal 1978.

[83] Roux 479, ad 748. Cf. also lines 1090-1.

> and the poor head, which his mother just then seized in her hands, she fixed on the point of her thyrsus and as if it belonged to a mountain lion she carries it right across Cithaeron
>
> (*Ba.* 1139-42, transl. G.S. Kirk)

As will be clear from Agave's words in 1215 and 1278, she really thinks she is carrying the head of a lion. Thus ὡς ὀρεστέρου λέοντος, far from being a figure of speech, represents Agave's dramatic delusion, which first manifested itself in 1107-9 (θῆρ'),[84] and had been foreshadowed by the chorus in 989-90.

This example ends my discussion of comparisons and focalization in the messenger-speech. Euripides' comparisons are generally held in low esteem by scholars, who dismiss them as "short, unoriginal, too few, and carelessly repeated to the point of cliché".[85] Both Barlow (1971: 96-119) and Kurtz have tried, each in their own way, to modify this negative view. I hope that my discussion, showing that comparisons are a means by which the messenger can make clear his focalization, also has contributed to Euripides' 'rehabilitation' in this respect.

Having discussed four categories of 'subjectivity' (concluding evaluation, interspersed criticism and engagement, epithets, and comparisons), all of which had at least been touched upon by scholars, I turn now to my fifth and last category, one which has not yet been studied: denomination.

(v) Denomination

By denomination I mean the way in which characters are referred to: by name, or by means of a periphrasis like 'your brother', 'my master', etc. In ancient rhetorical theory, we find the trope known as *pronominatio* (ἀντονομασία): "die Setzung eines Appellativs (λέξις) oder einer Periphrase (φράσις) an die Stelle eines Eigennamens".[86] In the present subsection we will see that the Euripidean messenger uses denomination, notably the periphrastic type, as a powerful narrative technique to

[84] See Ch. 1, p. 59.

[85] Barlow 1971: 96-7, summarizing Breitenbach.

[86] Lausberg 300. For examples of denomination in the *Iliad*, see De Jong 1987a: 103-5 and 1987c: 109.

express his own emotions and opinions, and to elicit those of his addressees.[87] I distinguish three groups:

1. denomination which originates in the person of the messenger ('my ...');
2. denomination which originates in the person of the messenger's internal addressee ('your ...');
3. denomination which originates neither in the messenger nor in his addressee but in a third-person ('his/her/x's ...').

An example of periphrastic denomination which originates in the person of the messenger is:

> δεσπότης δ' ἐμὸς
> τἀναντί' ηὔχετ'
>
> But my master [Orestes] prayed the opposite
> (*El.* 808-9, transl. M.J. Cropp)

In this passage the substitution of 'my master' for Orestes does not seem to be aimed at a special effect.[88] In the following passage, on the other hand,

> κἀνταῦθ' Ὀρέστου μῦθος ἰσχύων μέγα
> ἐφαίνεθ', ὡς ψεύδοιτο δεσπότης ἐμός
> ἥκων ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς.
>
> And at that point Orestes' word turned out to be stronger, viz. that my master [Neoptolemus] was lying and came with bad intentions.
> (*Andr.* 1109-11)

δεσπότης ἐμός emphasizes the Messenger's indignation and frustration when he realizes that the Delphians did not believe his (innocent) master. And again in

> Δελφῶν δ' ἄνακτες ὥρισαν πετρορριφῆ
> θανεῖν ἐμὴν δέσποιναν οὐ ψήφῳ μιᾷ

[87] Periphrastic denomination is rare in Aeschylean messenger-speeches (*Pers.* 356, *Th.* 576, 632); it occurs more often in Sophoclean ones (*Ant.* 1196, 1208, 1219, 1231, 1234, *Tr.* 901, 902, 928, 932, 936, 942, *OC* 1588, 1608, 1639), but Euripides surpasses his colleagues in both frequency and variety.

[88] Other examples: *Hipp.* 1219, *El.* 830, *Ba.* 1046.

and the Delphian masters have ordained unanimously that my mistress [Creousa] is to die a death of stoning

(*Ion* 1222-3)

the denomination shows the Messenger's engagement with his unfortunate mistress.[89] The same feeling becomes explicit in his next denomination:

πᾶσα δὲ ζητεῖ πόλις
τὴν ἀθλίως σπεύσασαν ἀθλίαν ὁδόν

and the whole city is looking for her who has pursued a wretched course in a wretched way

(*Ion* 1225-6)

In the next passage:

ὡς δ' εἶδον ἐλάτῃ δεσπότην ἐφήμενον

When they [Maenads] saw my master [Pentheus] seated on the fir tree

(*Ba.* 1095, transl. G.S. Kirk)

the denomination 'my master' must derive from the Messenger, as the Maenads, who strictly speaking are focalizing here (εἶδον), do not recognize Pentheus at this stage. It expresses his sympathy for his master, who finds himself in an increasingly difficult situation.

In the following passage the denomination corresponds to the Messenger's personal frame of reference:

οἳ δὲ πρὸς θρόνους ἔσω
μολόντες ἃς ἔγημ' ὁ τοξότας Πάρις
γυναικός

They came in to the seat of her whom Paris the bowman wed [Helen]

(*Or.* 1408-10, transl. M.L. West)

[89] Other examples: *Hipp.* 1187 and 1196 (the denomination emphasizes the Messenger's loyalty); *Andr.* 1146 (admiration for his heroic master); *Ion* 1186 (disbelief: cf. p. 15); *Ph.* 1461 (indicates to which side he belongs); *Med.* 1144 (δέσποινα δ' ἣν νῦν ἀντὶ σοῦ θαυμάζομεν) is somewhat more difficult: why does the Messenger refer to Creon's daughter in this way? As is clear from 1130, the Messenger is a law-abiding person, and in 1144 he seems to be reminding Medea of her changed situation, the fact that she is no longer the mistress of the house.

To the Phrygian Messenger Helen is first and foremost wife of Paris (rather than of Menelaus).[90]

I turn now to the second group, viz. denomination which finds its origin in the person of the messenger's internal addressee. In the following example that addressee is Medea:

δι' ὤτων δ' εὐθὺς ἦν πολὺς λόγος
σὲ καὶ πόσιν σὸν νεῖκος ἐσπεῖσθαι τὸ πρίν.

and immediately much talk went round that you and your husband [Jason] had made up your former strife.

(*Med.* 1139-40)

Here the 'your' denomination does not appear to have any particular force (Medea herself also refers to Jason with πόσις, e.g. in 690, 876). However, as will be readily understood, most instances of this type do have an (emotive) function: the messenger's internal addressee is drawn more closely into the story. A clear and effective example is provided by the messenger-speech of *Hipp.* Throughout his story the Messenger refers to Hippolytus as 'my master' (1187, 1196, 1219), but in his concluding evaluation, he suddenly switches to a 'your' denomination:

δοῦλος μὲν οὖν ἔγωγε σῶν δόμων, ἄναξ,
ἀτὰρ τοσοῦτόν γ' ου δυνήσομαί ποτε,
τὸν σὸν πιθέσθαι παῖδ' ὅπως ἐστὶν κακός

I am only a slave in your household, master, but I shall never be able to believe such a monstrous thing, that your son is base

(*Hipp.* 1249-51)

At this important moment, when the Messenger turns directly to his addressee Theseus (ἄναξ) and tries to convince him of Hippolytus' innocence, he reminds him that the person whose fatal accident has just been reported is, after all, his son.

The Messenger in *Andr.* turns to his addressee Peleus when recounting a particularly heroic feat of Neoptolemus:

[90] Cf. in this same messenger-speech the denomination of Orestes in 1402 as 'son of the commander' [Agamemnon]. See pp. 90-1 on this Messenger's comparisons, which also draw on his war experience.

δεινὰς δ' ἂν εἶδες πυρρίχας φρουρουμένου
βέλεμνα παιδός.

and you might have seen the terrible dance of your grandson [Neoptolemus] warding off the projectiles.

(*Andr.* 1135-6)

As Stevens aptly comments, "there is pathos in the reminder of the relationship to the listening Peleus of the man whose last moments are here narrated".[91] The effect of engagement attained by means of παιδός is enhanced by the use of the second-person past potential ἂν εἶδες, which turns Peleus into a kind of eyewitness himself.[92] The Messenger in *Hec.* refers no fewer than four times to Polyxena as 'your [Hecuba's] child': 519, 522, 526, 580-1. Similarly, the Messenger in *Or.* (1), speaking to Electra, refers to Orestes as σὸν σύγγονον five times, out of a total of nine references: 880, 891, 899, 931, 945.

In all the cases discussed so far, the emotion expressed by the 'your' denomination was pity. In the following passage it is indignation and contempt:

λαβὼν δὲ προχύτας μητρὸς εὐνέτης σέθεν
ἔβαλλε βωμούς, τοιάδ' ἐννέπων ἔπη·
Νύμφαι πετραῖαι, πολλάκις με βουθυτεῖν
καὶ τὴν κατ' οἴκους Τυνδαρίδα δάμαρτ' ἐμὴν
πράσσοντας ὡς νῦν, τοὺς δ' ἐμοὺς ἐχθροὺς κακῶς —

Then taking the barley-grain your mother's consort [Aegisthus] stood strewing the altar and uttering these words: "Nymphs of the rocks, may I make many sacrifices, I and my wife at home, Tyndareus' daughter, faring as we now fare, while our enemies fare ill"

(*El.* 803-7, transl. M.J. Cropp)

Through this contemptuous denomination — which he knows his addressee Electra will appreciate — the Messenger seems to wish to neutralize Aegisthus' use of δάμαρτ' ἐμὴν in his prayer (806).[93]

[91] Müller-Goldingen 211 seems to have overlooked this passage; he says that this messenger-speech (like *Ph.* (3) and (4)) lacks references to the internal addressee.
[92] Cf. Stevens ad *Andr.* 1135 and see p. 105 on the past potentials of *Ba.* (1).
[93] Cf. Denniston ad 803.

The first two messenger-speeches in *Ph.* display an interesting pattern of denomination: in *Ph.* (1), which describes the battle between the armies of Eteocles and Polyneices, each of the two is referred to as 'your [Jocasta's] son'.[94] In *Ph.* (2), which describes the preparations for the duel between Eteocles and Polyneices, the two are referred to mainly in the plural or dual form: 'your two sons'.[95] The 'your' denomination which at first had a neutral tone, now acquires an urgent meaning, and prepares us for the Messenger's advice to Jocasta at the end of his speech: στεῖχ', ἐρήτυσον τέκνα δεινῆς ἁμίλλης (1260-1).

Finally, the Messenger in *Ba.* (1), addressing Pentheus, twice refers to Agave as 'your mother' (682, 689). While neither pity nor contempt is involved here, the denomination is not neutral either: "remarquer la valeur emphatique du possessif σή, mis en relief par la césure" (Roux ad 680-2). The 'your' denomination seems to be motivated by two factors: first, Agave's status as mother of Pentheus makes her the centre of interest for the herdsmen (cf. 719-21); second, Pentheus is interested primarily in his mother's behaviour as maenad.

I turn now to the third group, viz. 'third-person' denomination. In the following example:

> παῖδες δὲ πέπλων μητρὸς ἐξηρτημένοι
> ἔκλαιον
>
> and the children kept clinging to their mother's [Alcestis] cloths and wailing
> (*Alc.* 189-90, transl. D.J. Conacher)

the denomination μητρός has been chosen in accordance with παῖδες. This type of denomination lends itself to pathetic exploitation. Thus in the passage above, μητρός enhances the pitifulness of the scene. I will discuss two more examples:

[94] Eteocles: σὸς παῖς (1095), παῖς σός (1164, 1169); Polyneices: ὁ σὸς ... Πολυνείκης (1123), σὸς ... γόνος (1144).

[95] τὼ παῖδε τὼ σώ (1219), τέκνα (1260), δισσοῖν ... τέκνοιν (1263). For δισσοὶ γέροντος Οἰδίπου νεανίαι (1243) see p. 101. For Euripides' use of the dual in the play as a whole, see Craik ad 69 and 1219. Note that *Ph.* (3) and (4), which are addressed to Creon, contain no 'your' denomination at all (cf. Müller-Goldingen 210-11).

εὐθὺς δ' ἡ μὲν ἐς πατρὸς δόμους
ὥρμησεν, ἡ δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀρτίως πόσιν,
φράσουσα νύμφης συμφοράν

and immediately one servant rushed away to the father's [Creon] house, another to the newly wedded husband [Jason] to tell him the disaster which had befallen his bride [Creon's daughter]

(*Med.* 1177-9)

This passage focuses on the unfortunate princess, and it is in her person that the first two denominations (πατρός, πόσιν) originate.[96] The addition of ἀρτίως to πόσις in 1178 further strengthens the pathos of this denomination.[97] In its turn, πόσις triggers νύμφης, the only time Creon's daughter is referred to in this way by the Messenger.[98]

The second example is:

φθάνει δ' ὁ τλήμων γόνασι προσπεσὼν πατρὸς
καὶ πρὸς γένειον χεῖρα καὶ δέρην βαλὼν
Ὦ φίλτατ', αὐδᾷ, μή μ' ἀποκτείνῃς, πάτερ·
σός εἰμι, σὸς παῖς

and the unfortunate one darted to his father's knees and putting his hand on his beard and throat he cried: "o dearest one, do not kill me, father, I am yours, I am your son"

(*HF* 986-9)

The use of πατρός emphasizes the horror of what is taking place: a father unknowingly kills his own sons. The denomination also prepares us for the pathetic supplication of Heracles' son in 987-8.[99]

Thus far I have discussed examples of 'third-person' denomination of the type 'his/her father/mother', etc. There is another type: 'son/daughter of x'. This is found, for example, in:

[96] Cf. also πατήρ in 1204 and 1220.

[97] Contrast Medea's derogative use of νεωστί in 366 and 514.

[98] Elsewhere he calls her δέσποινα (1144, see n. 89), ἡ τάλαινα (1184), τῆς δυσδαίμονος (1189), παῖς (1220).

[99] Other examples: *HF* 930 (πατρός), 973 (μητρός), 1014 (δάμαρτ'); *Ph.* 1429 (μήτηρ), 1439 (μητρός), 1442-3 (κασιγνήτην ... μητέρ'), 1455 (μήτηρ); *Ba.* 1092, 1114, 1140 (μήτηρ).

ἡ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς πρὸς θάλασσαν ἐστάλη

and the daughter of Zeus [Helen] went to the sea

(*Hel.* 1527)[100]

This kind of denomination is, of course, familiar from the Homeric epics, and a special effect seems to be intended in only a few cases, such as the following:

ἤδη δ' ἔκρυπτον σῶμα παγχάλκοις ὅπλοις
δισσοὶ γέροντος Οἰδίπου νεανίαι

Already the two young sons of aged Oedipus [Eteocles, Polyneices] began to cover their bodies with arms all of bronze

(*Ph.* 1242-3 and cf. 1360, transl. E. Craik)

where the name of Oedipus reminds us of his curse against his sons (67-8), now about to be fulfilled.[101] In similar fashion, the repeated reference by the Messenger in *Andr.* to Neoptolemus as παῖς 'Αχιλλέως (1119, 1149-50, 1163) is relevant[102] in that (1) Neoptolemus' first visit to Delphi, which led to the present one, had to do with his father (cf. 50-5, 1107-8), and (2) the Messenger likes to compare Neoptolemus with his father, thereby portraying him as an equally impressive fighter (cf. τὸ Τρωϊκὸν πήδημα πηδήσας in 1139 and Stevens' commentary *ad loc.*). In this same messenger-speech, Orestes is once (1090) referred to as Agamemnon's son (cf. 892, 1061), and once (1115) as Clytemnestra's son; the latter designation is clearly meant to emphasize his role as a scheming murderer.[103]

[100] Cf. 1493. Other examples: *Supp.* 656 (παῖδα ... Αἰγέως=Theseus); *HF* 929 ('Αλκμήνης τόκος=Heracles, cf. 712. The reason that reference is made to Heracles' mother rather than his father seems to be the fact that the identity of the latter is disputed, cf. 353-4); *IT* 1331 and 1398 ('Αγαμέμνονος παῖς=Iphigeneia, cf. 238, 801, 1158), 1416

[101] Cf. Müller-Goldingen 193 and Craik ad 1242-3.

[102] Cf. Stevens ad 14 (Νεοπτολέμῳ): "Though N. is repeatedly mentioned in this play the name occurs only here, partly on metrical grounds, but periphrases reminding us of his lineage are sometimes dramatically effective."

[103] Cf. Erdmann 136. In lines 1027-36 the chorus had recalled both the killing of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra and the killing of Clytemnestra by Orestes.

The most creative of all messengers in the field of denomination is the Messenger of *Ion*. For this reason, I have saved until last his *tour de force* in coming up with a new reference every time he mentions Ion.[104] He never refers to Ion by name, but calls him: παῖδα τὸν καινόν (1123: triggered by πόσις Κρεούσης=Xuthus), ὁ ... νεανίας (1132), τῷ νέῳ ... δεσπότῃ (1183: triggered by ὁ δέ=the old man), παῖς ὁ νέος (1186), παιδὶ τῷ πεφηνότι (1188), ὁ καινὸς ... γόνος (1202), ὁ μαντευτὸς γόνος (1209), ὁ πυθόχρηστος Λοξίου νεανίας (1218), τὸν ἱερόν (1224: focalization of the Δελφῶν ἄνακτες). Why these many periphrases, why this avoidance of Ion's proper name? The Messenger seems loath to use the name Xuthus gave to his son (cf. 661-3, 800-2), because he is a servant of Creusa (cf. 1106-7, 1186). Through his use of denominations, he stresses the fact that Ion is Xuthus' new son, appointed as such by Apollo's oracle. He seems intent upon exculpating his mistress: she was forced to her desperate move, because she felt deserted by Xuthus and Apollo (cf. 864, 878-80[105]) and, as the Old Man suggested to her in 846-9 and 978, she had reason to fear the new father and son (compare in particular, the Old Man's denomination παῖδα τὸν ἐπὶ σοὶ πεφηνότα in 978 with the Messenger's παιδὶ τῷ πεφηνότι in 1188).[106]

The discussion of denomination confronts us once more with the messenger's focalization. The particular aspect of focalization under discussion here consists in chosing whether to refer to, say, Neoptolemus as 'my master', 'your grandson' or 'Achilles' son'. The choice of denomination either reflects the messenger's own feelings, or triggers those of his addressees.

The analysis of the messenger's function as focalizer leads to the conclusion that his account is not objective, detached or neutral, but rather coloured and engaged, at times emotive, partial, or pathetic, though never untrue, as regards the basic facts. However, this is not the whole story. For what is the function and effect of this 'subjectivity'? (I use this inadequate term here to sum up the adjectives "coloured",

[104] Cf. Owen ad 1210.

[105] The lines 846-9 may be spurious.

[106] Cf. also the reaction of the chorus of Athenian girls in 676-724.

"engaged", etc.) To answer this question we must now turn from sender to receiver, from the messenger to his internal and external addressees.

2.5 From presentation to reception

In the previous section we have seen how the messenger sometimes chooses a denomination with his internal addressee in mind: τὸν <u>σὸν</u> πόσιν. Here we are dealing with an explicit "sign of the 'you'", as Prince 16 terms it: an explicit acknowledgement by a narrator (the 'I' of the presentation) of the presence of his addressee (the 'you' of the reception). There are other such signs of the 'you' in the Euripidean messenger-speech.[107]

Signs of the 'you'

As in the case of the first-person predicates discussed in Chapter 1 (pp. 3-5), some messenger-speeches have a relatively large number of signs of the 'you' (*Med.*, *IT* (2), *Hel.* (2), *Or.* (1), *Ba.* (1)), while others have fewer (*Ph.* (3), *Or.* (2), *Ba.* (2)) or even none at all (*Alc.*, *Supp.*, *HF*, *Ion*). The first thing to note here is that in the messenger-speeches in *Alc.*, *HF*, *Ion*, *Or.* (2) and *Ba.* (2), the internal addressee is only the chorus (not chorus *and* one of the protagonists), which may account for the scarcity or absence of signs of the 'you'. In the messenger-speech in *Supp.*, the Messenger ignores Adrastus: not only are there no signs of the 'you' in the narrative itself, but in 634 he addresses only the chorus, and in 644 refers to Adrastus in the third person. This is no coincidence:[108] the Messenger seems to blame Adrastus for having undertaken the Expedition of the Seven, which came to an unhappy end, not least for him (the Messenger) self. Despite the fact that he does not address Adrastus, the Messenger clearly acknowledges his presence and intends his words to be heard by him too. It is with an eye to Adrastus that he describes in such graphic detail the horrors of the battle (see pp. 72-3). Though he reports a victory he leaves no doubt that a high price had to

[107] See Fischl 29 and Erdmann 89, notes 5 and 6. A complete inventory of signs of the 'you' is given in Appendix G.

[108] And certainly not, as Grube 235, n. 2 says (quoting Sheppard, *Greek tragedy*, p. 5): "perhaps 'a trace of primitive construction'".

be paid.[109] In particular, his concluding evaluation on the best kind of general is directed to Adrastus rather than the chorus of Argive women. As is clear from his speech 734ff., Adrastus has understood the Messenger's message.[110]

As for those messenger-speeches which abound in signs of the 'you', this abundance serves a definite rhetorical function. As we have seen (pp. 54-6), the Messengers in *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2), who must report the failure of their mission to their superiors Thoas and Theoclymenus, try to transfer responsibility to them. Hence it is understandable that they address them repeatedly, so as to stress their involvement in the events. To give one example, the implicit criticism expressed by the signs of the 'you' in

καὶ τάδ' ἦν ὕποπτα μέν,
ἤρεσκε μέντοι σοῖσι προσπόλοις, ἄναξ.

and this looked suspicious, but was accepted by your servants, master.
(*IT* 1334-5)

becomes explicit in

ἡμῖν δ' ἦν μὲν ἥδ' ὑποψία
λόγος τ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισι, τῶν ἐπεσβατῶν
ὡς πλῆθος εἴη· διεσιωπῶμεν δ' ὅμως
τοὺς σοὺς λόγους σῴζοντες· ἄρχειν γὰρ νεὼς
ξένον κελεύσας πάντα συνέχεας τάδε.

and we considered this suspicious and talked about the great number of those coming aboard. Yet we kept silent, obeying your instructions: for having ordered the stranger to be in command you have ruined everything.
(*Hel.* 1549-53)

[109] Cf. Greenwood 103: "... the messenger's speech is no mere conventional battle-piece. It stresses the physical horrors of combat; and it insists on the obstinacy of the struggle, which went on for a long time undecided, until at last — ... — at last the Thebans gave way".

[110] Cf. Collard 1975: 273.

In the case of *Or.* (1) the Messenger uses the repeated signs of the 'you' to give expression to his attachment to the house of Agamemnon (cf. 868-70).[111]

The messenger who appeals most urgently to his addressee is the Messenger in *Ba.* (1). He twice critizes Pentheus' negative opinion of Maenadism (686-8, 712-3); he stresses the fact that Pentheus' mother is involved (682, 689); he makes him the subject of the comparison of 746-7 (θᾶσσον ... διεφοροῦντο ... ἢ <u>σὲ</u> ξυνάψαι);[112] he urges him to accept Dionysus (769-70); and above all he makes him into a kind of eyewitness (εἰ παρῆσθα: 712, ἂν προσεῖδες: 737, εἶδες ... ἄν: 740). Such second-person past potentials are also found in other messenger-speeches (*Andr.* 1135, *Hel.* 1606, *Ph.* 1150, *Ba.* 1085), but never in such profusion as here. In general, the intended effect of this device is to draw one's addressees more into the story.[113] In the particular case of the messenger-speech in *Ba.* (1), the Messenger seems intent on increasing the credibility of the wondrous (θαυμάτων ... κρείσσονα: 667) things he is reporting.[114] At the same time, his words have the effect of stimulating Pentheus' curiosity and triggering his desire to go and look for himself.[115] Finally, as Winnington-Ingram 1948: 96 notes, from the point of view of the spectators, the effect of this emphasis on Pentheus as potential eyewitness is one of irony: Pentheus will indeed be an eyewitness ... of Bacchanals of which he himself will be the victim.

Using the 'you' form is the most obvious and direct way in which messengers appeal to their addressees. But all the narrative techniques analyzed in this and the previous chapter are in fact used with these addressees in mind. The messenger does not merely deliver his message; he is conscious of his addressees, revealing to them his own emotions

[111] Similarly, the repeated signs of the 'you' in *Hec.* give expression to Talthybius' engagement with the fate of his addressee (cf. 488-500).

[112] In the other comparative comparisons the subject is τις (*Hipp.* 1186) or δρομεύς (*El.* 824).

[113] Cf. *On the sublime* 26: 'this device makes the listener more moved (ἐμπαθέσ-τερον), attentive (προσεκτικώτερον) and full of active interest (ἀγῶνος ἔμπλεων)'. See also De Jong 1987a: 54-60 on second-person predicates in the *Iliad.*

[114] Cf. Roux 476, ad 737 and 477, ad 739-41.

[115] Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1948: 88.

and opinions concerning the facts he reports. Whether expressed explicitly or implied by means of more subtle narrative techniques, these emotions and opinions form a pattern, conveying a second, subjective message, which supplements the first, factual message. This is what we might call the messenger's *own* message.

The messenger's own message

One of the clearest examples of a messenger's own message is to be found in *Hipp.* According to the Messenger, Theseus has treated his own son unjustly, making him the innocent victim of a horrible accident. In order to make this clear, the Messenger (1) stresses the loyalty and devotion of Hippolytus' friends and servants; (2) thrice quotes Hippolytus in direct speech, where the latter stresses his own innocence, but is nevertheless prepared to obey his father's orders; (3) describes in full the frightfulness of the monstrous bull sent by Poseidon; (4) emphasizes Hippolytus' expertise in handling horses, which makes the manner of his death all the more tragic; (5) does not leave his personal conviction that Hippolytus is innocent unexpressed; (6) reminds Theseus that they are talking not of just anyone, but of his own son.[116]

And what of the other messengers? In *Med.* the message of the Messenger is that Creon and his daughter died in a piteous fashion;[117] in *Heracl.* that Eurystheus is a coward, and Iolaus a hero; in *Andr.* that Neoptolemus is a hero, and Orestes a detestable schemer; in *Hec.* that Polyxena having to die was a pity, the manner of her death dignified; in *Supp.* that war is gruesome and should be avoided as much as possible, and that Theseus is the best kind of general to have; in *HF* that Heracles is as much to be pitied as his victims; in *IT* (1) that the two strangers who were captured are noble and brave, and therefore particularly suited to atone for Iphigeneia's treatment in Aulis; in *IT* (2) that due to Thoas

[116] Cf. Heath 155-7 and my own observations on φρικῶδες ἀντεφθέγγετ' in 1216 (p. 10), the Messenger's personal comment in 1249-54 (p. 66), the comparison in 1186 (p. 91), the epithets in 1223, 1225, 1245 (p. 84), and the denomination in 1251 (p. 97).

[117] Although he pities Medea's victims and is shocked at the boldness of her deed, the Messenger suppresses an explicit condemnation of Medea, his former mistress (1222), showing sympathetic understanding for the disagreeable situation in which Jason placed her (1138: σοῖς κακοῖς) and warning her to flee (1122-3).

rather than his poor beaten-up sailors, Iphigeneia and her brother have unfortunately escaped; in *El.* that Orestes' killing of Aegisthus is a brilliant and daring victory; in *Ion* that Creusa's attempt to kill Ion, while unacceptable, is understandable under the circumstances; in *Hel.* (2) that due to Theoclymenus, Helen and Menelaus have unfortunately escaped, wreaking havoc among the Egyptian sailors; in *Ph.* (1) that happily Thebes has withstood the attack of the Argive army; in *Ph.* (2) that the duel between the two brothers is bound to end in disaster and should be stopped; in *Ph.* (3) and (4) that Polyneices, Eteocles and Iocaste died tragic deaths, the first two having killed each other (thereby fulfilling their father's curse), the third having killed herself; in *Or.* (1) that Orestes and Electra have been wrongfully sentenced to death in an unfair trial;[118] in *Or.* (2) that Orestes and Pylades are aggressive beasts;[119] in *Ba.* (1) that Dionysus' power is so overwhelming[120] that it would be better to accept this god;[121] in *Ba.* (2) that Pentheus has died a most tragic death at the hands of his own deluded mother. The most difficult message to grasp is that of the messenger-speech in *Alc.*, not least because it comes so early in the play. My understanding of this message is as follows: whereas Alcestis indicates that she sees her sacrifice as her duty, and regrets her misfortune (cf. 168: εὐδαίμονας, 182: εὐτυχής), the Messenger goes further than that, questioning the value of the sacrifice: Admetus' losses will be greater than his gains.[122]

[118] An explanation for the biased report is given by Eucken 163: "Es mag erstaunen, daß die Verurteilung ... mit solcher Entschiedenheit negativ dargestellt wird, da ihre Tat doch allen, auch ihnen selbst, verwerflich schien. Aber diese Bewertung ist angemessen, wenn man das Problem des Muttermordes im allgemeinen Zusammenhang einer Kritik an der Vergeltungsmoral überhaupt sieht. Seine Bestrafung durch den Tod muß dann als sinnlose Fortsetzung des prinzipiell gleichen Unrechts erscheinen."

[119] The Messenger expresses more aversion to the attackers (see pp. 51-2) than pity for the victims Helen and Hermione (only in 1467: κρᾶτα μέλεον, 1490: ἁ τάλαιν' Ἑρμιόνα, 1491: ματρός, ἅ νιν ἔτεκεν τλάμων).

[120] This conviction is based not so much on Dionysus' peaceful miracles in 704-11, as on the fact that he provides the Maenads with the power to defeat men (748-68). It is only in retrospect, after he has been converted, that he also shows reverence for the peaceful manifestation of the god (712-22, see p. 51).

[121] Thus this messenger-speech forms the god's last warning, see pp. 122-3.

[122] Cf. Kullmann 131.

The next consideration is whether the messenger is always successful in conveying his own message to his addressees. How do they react to the news he brings? Do they share his feelings? I will start with the messenger's internal addressees: the chorus or the chorus and one or more protagonist(s) (see Appendix D).

Reactions (1). The internal addressees

All messengers find a willing ear, even when their news is bad,[123] but opinions may differ as to whether the news is good or bad.[124] Sometimes the internal addressees share the messenger's feelings, which may be feelings of

– grief (Peleus + chorus in *Andr.*, Hecuba + chorus in *Hec.*,[125] chorus in *HF*,[126] Creon + chorus in *Ph.* (3) and (4), Electra + chorus in *Or.* (1))

– concern (chorus in *Ion*, Jocasta + chorus in *Ph.* (2)),[127]

– joy (Alcmene + chorus in *Heracl.*, Electra + chorus in *El.*, Jocasta + chorus in *Ph.* (1)).

The messenger-speech in *Hipp.* is a special case. Here the rhetoric of the Messenger is effective enough to change Theseus' extreme harshness towards his son, displayed in the introductory dialogue (1164-5, 1169-72), into a more lenient attitude (1257-60).[128] In particular, the Mes-

[123] Cf. *Andr.* 1084 (σήμαιν'· ἀκοῦσαι δ' οὐκ ἀκούσθ' ὅμως θέλω) and *Hec.* 517 (εἰπέ, καίπερ οὐ λέξων φίλα).

[124] Cf. Erdmann 39-55, who, however, bases his classification ("I. Negative Nachrichten a) nach Meinung beider Partner, b) nach Meinung des Boten gegen die des Adressaten, II. Positive Nachrichten a,b") on the introductory dialogue only. As a result, he does not distinguish between protagonist-addressee and chorus-addressee, and also misses cases where emotions are different *after* the messenger-speech, as in *Hipp.*

[125] Note that of the Messenger's double message (Polyxena died tragically, but admirably) the chorus reacts only to the first part (583-4), Hecuba to both (grief: 585-90, pride: 591-8).

[126] Note in particular 1032-3 (τέκνα πρὸ πατρὸς ἄθλια κείμενα δυστάνου), which shows that the chorus, like the Messenger, pities both slain and slayer.

[127] Note that the chorus is more pessimistic (1284-1306) than Jocasta, who still believes she may arrive in time (1280-1) and put an end to the duel (1277).

[128] Cf. Grube 191-2, Lesky 321, and Heath 157: "Theseus ... is left with sympathies torn; he has been offered no hard evidence of his son's innocence, so that

senger's use of the 'you' form in his peroration (τὸν σὸν ... παῖδ') has had the desired effect on Theseus: αἰδούμενος ... ἐκεῖνον [Hipp.] ..., οὕνεκ' ἐστὶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ (1258-9).

Sometimes there is a marked discrepancy between the emotions of the messenger and those of his internal addressees: in *Med.* Medea rejoices over the death of Creon and his daughter, while the Messenger pities them;[129] in *Or.* (2) the chorus of Argive women favours Orestes and Pylades, while the Messenger abhors them; in *Ba.* (2) the chorus of Asiatic Maenads rejoices over Dionysus' victory, while the Messenger pities Pentheus. *Ba.* (1) is a special case: the Messenger, convinced of Dionysus' power on account of the phenomena he has witnessed, tries in turn to convince Pentheus. The latter, however, far from being converted is only further enraged upon hearing those phenomena described.[130] The message of the female Messenger in *Alc.* is not caught by her male addressees:[131] in 213-43 they still show themselves concerned primarily about Admetus, and although they pray for a miracle which would save Alcestis from having to die, they do not question the — doubtful — gains of the sacrifice itself. In the case of *IT* (1), Iphigeneia at first, like the Messenger, feels no pity for the strangers and accepts the idea of sacrificing them (348-50). Gradually, however, her former aversion to the ritual returns (380-91), and upon seeing them, she finds herself pitying the victims (472ff.).

Opinions may also differ within the group formed by the messenger's internal addressees, as in *IT* (2) and *Hel.* (2): the chorus in both plays,

his resentment cannot be broken down entirely (1265-7); but his final indecisiveness is in marked contrast to the attitude with which he began the scene, intransigent and harsh". For the reaction of the chorus, see n. 133.

[129] The chorus shows no pity, or very little, if we accept 1233-5 as genuine, cf. earlier 978-88. Is Medea's gloating over her dead enemies perhaps another feature of her portrayal as a 'heroic' character (see Knox 1977: 196-9 and Bongie)?

[130] Cf. Grube 413, Dodds 163 ("Pentheus is angrier than before"), Winnington-Ingram 1948: 88, Roux 459. It appears from 814 (λυπρῶς νιν εἰσίδοιμ' ἂν ἐξῳνωμένας) that, despite the Messenger's explicit denial in 686-7, Pentheus still expects to see the Maenads drunk.

[131] Several commentators (Grube 131, n. 1, Lesky 292, Vellacott 104, 218) stress the importance of the fact that the Messenger's addressees are male (and therefore likely to sympathize with Admetus' point of view), while the Messenger herself is female (and therefore sympathetic to Alcestis).

consisting of female retainers of Iphigeneia and Helen, favour the escape of their mistress and compatriot, whereas the protagonist-addressees, Thoas and Theoclymenus, obviously, do not. In the case of the messenger-speech of *Supp.*, the chorus of mothers of the Dead naturally respond with boundless enthusiasm to the news of the victory, which means the return of the bodies (641-3, 731-3), whereas Adrastus embarks on a philosophical reflection on the "folly of men's resort to war, where words would serve as well to settle differences" (734-49).[132]

So much for the feelings of the internal addressees, which vary and are not necessarily the same as those of the messenger. I turn now to his external addressees.

Reactions (2). The external addressees

For a number of reasons, the category of external addressees is far more difficult to handle than that of the internal ones. To begin with, we are dealing with a heterogeneous group, consisting both of Euripides' original audience, as well as all subsequent readers and spectators up to the present day. In the second place, we know little or nothing about the reactions of the Athenian public.

All too often scholars pass off their *own* reactions as those of the Athenian spectators or Euripides' later readers, using a vague 'we'. This results in conflicting statements, such as the following concerning *Or.* (2):

> And they [Orestes and Pylades] will have the sympathy of many, not only of the chorus (1153-40, in killing the woman whom all men, whether Trojan or Greek, regarded as the cause of their sufferings ... It is unlikely that <u>we</u> are expected to sympathize with Helen, and her strange disappearance at the end leaves <u>us</u> almost indifferent. (Grube 391-2)

> The Phrygian is one of the three persons in the play whom the poet allows <u>us</u> to think of as honest and good ... His horror and revulsion (1455-7) at what was done shame not only the criminals, but still more the ladies of the chorus for their complicity — though to their now corrupted perception he is a comic and nothing else. (Vellacott 77)

[132] Collard 1975: 273, ad 734-777. Adrastus' moral reform has also been assisted by the fact that he witnessed as *tertius silens* Theseus' conversion by Aethra, and Theseus' defence of democratic ideals against the Herald (Collard 1975: 209).

> eine komische Partie, welche ... mehr der Belustigung der Zuschauer dient, denen besonders die Darstellung der Feigheit von Barbaren hellenischem Mut gegenüber gefallen muß. (Wecklein ad 1353-1548)

> Oder glaubt wirklich jemand, Euripides habe es als sittlich berechtigt und als eine ruhmeswürdige Tat angesehen, wenn zwei starke Jünglinge ein wehrloses Weib an den Herd, die heiligste Stätte des Hauses, schleppen, um es dort umzubringen ...? (Pohlenz 420)

Other scholars take either the messenger's stance or that of his internal addressees as their criterion. Neither of the two is, however, necessarily a reliable guide to the emotional response of the external addressees. I will begin with the internal addressees. In the case of the messenger-speech in *Alc.*, the reaction of the external addressees differs from that of the internal addressees: "the insistence on Admetus' misfortune and the pity lavished upon him [by the chorus in 213-43] seem somewhat strange to us, as our own sympathy is likely to be with the queen".[133] Again, Medea's gloating over the death of her opponents is likely only to increase the external addressees' pity for her victims. As for the messenger, I disagree with Wilamowitz 1959: 203 that his "Stimmung den Hörern gleichgültig ist". He certainly may be a guide to the external addressees' emotional response, as in the messenger-speech of *Hipp.*, for example.[134] This certainly is not always the case, however. A striking example of divergent opinions of messenger and external addressees is provided by the messenger-speech in *El.* While the Messenger, Electra and the chorus rejoice over Orestes' killing of Aegisthus, which they

[133] Grube 134. Cf. the messenger-speech in *Hipp.* where the external audience is likely to be consumed by pity for Hippolytus, while the chorus sing a hymn to Aphrodite, "the very goddess who has brought his fate about" (Barrett 391, ad 1268-82); and *Hel.* (2): "it is the fugitives who have all our sympathy so that the news, however tragic for the king and his men, remains good news for us" (Grube 350), "Besondere Freude werden die Athener daran gehabt haben, wie der anfangs mißtrauische Barbar hellenistischer List erliegt" (Pohlenz 385), Foley 1980: 125.

[134] Cf. Heath 157: "the speech has definite presuppositions, adopts definite attitudes, and expects an appropriate response: if you will, it defines very clearly the role of the implied audience". Another example is the messenger-speech in *Hec.*: "By freely showing his own feelings Talth. makes us the more clearly feel the admiration and pity which the maiden evoked from her enemies themselves, even from Neoptolemus" (Grube 219-20).

consider a victory (cf. 761, 762, 860-5, 872), most modern commentators[135] hold an entirely different view:

> Orestes and Pylades kill Aegisthus with every circumstance of dishonour (Kitto 336)

> It is typical of Euripides that he makes the murder of Aegisthus extremely unpleasant (Grube 308)

> Der Botenbericht zeigt Aegisth, das Opfer als einen arglosen gastfreundlichen Mann, den siegreichen Orest dagegen als einen verschlagenen, gefährlich geschickten und gänzlich skrupellosen Mörder (Erdmann 142-3)

Similarly, the Messenger in *Or.* (2) clearly detests Pylades (see pp. 51-2, 90-1), whereas an ancient critic like Aristophanes of Byzantium calls him the only noble character of the play.[136]

Having briefly sketched the methodological problems involved in dealing with the category of the external addressee, I return now to the subject of this section, viz. their reaction to messenger-speeches. I will rely mainly on the views of scholars, since these are the only reactions available. These reactions may vary, as in the case of the internal addressees. We have already seen how opinions differ concerning *Or.* (2). A similar example is that of *Ph.* (3) + (4). Lesky 452 and Müller-Goldingen 214-5, 218 are convinced that the Messenger sympathizes more with Polyneices than with Eteocles, while according to Erdmann 118-9, he favours both brothers equally. Is the messenger-speech in *Andr.* to be understood primarily as an attack on Spartan ways (Kitto 233), or on Apollo (Pohlenz 288), or does it provide another example of the tragic aftermath of the Trojan war (Stevens 14)? In the messenger-speech in *Heracl.* "ist die Absicht deutlich die Schlachtschilderung für die Argiver, deren Kampfkraft der Bote hervorhebt, schonend zu gestalten" (Lesky 354). According to Burian 14, however, "the messenger-speech conveys a sense of righteousness triumphant in its every detail. The triumph belongs to the suppliants themselves, the massed combat of the opposing armies is described in very general terms". Then there is what might be called the Riddle of *Ba.* (1): is the poet here "by

[135] Though not all. See Cropp ad 774-858 and De Jong 1990: 16-9.

[136] In the hypothesis: πλὴν γὰρ Πυλάδου πάντες φαῦλοι ἦσαν.

a fully and concrete picture of Dionysiac practice and psychology" giving "a commentary on Dionysiac 'wisdom'"[137] or is his message that Maenadism only becomes a threat when provoked, hence that it should be tolerated?[138] The diversity of opinions concerning these messenger-speeches indicates that this type of text is perhaps not so simple and straightforward as scholars, notably Grube,[139] hold them to be. Their subtlety and complexity have, I think, been underestimated. This may well have contributed to the idea that they are objective. Scholars unconsciously adopt the focalization of the messenger, taking what is, in effect, no more than his — subjective — opinion as an objective description. Three examples may serve to illustrate this phenomenon.

(1) Lesky 345 remarks on the messenger-speech in *Andr.*: "Meisterhaft ist der Angriff einer feigen Masse gegen den Achillessohn geschildert".[140] As we have seen (pp. 88), it is the Messenger who, through his use of the comparison ὅπως πελειάδες ἱέρακ' ἰδοῦσαι (1140-1), insinuates that the Delphians are cowards.

(2) Grube 172 comments on the messenger-speech in *Heracl.*:

> In the first [part of the messenger-speech] Hyllus challenges Eurystheus to single combat, but is refused; the main object of this is to bring Hyllus to the fore and to prove Eurystheus a coward[141]

Again, it is the Messenger who considers Eurystheus a coward (813-7), but cowardice is not necessarily the only explanation for Eurystheus' behaviour:

[137] Winnington-Ingram 1948: 89. As is clear from his discussion of the messenger-speech (and his book as a whole), he means a *negative* commentary.

[138] Dodds 159 and Grube 413.

[139] See above Preface, pp. viii-ix.

[140] And cf. Pohlenz 288: "und als diese [Delphians] bei ihrem heimtückischen Überfall von dem Helden feige zurückweichen".

[141] Cf. also Lesky's (363) paraphrase of *Supp.* 673-4: "Wirkungsvoll ist der Gegensatz zwischen dem Ruf des athenischen Herolds und dem *finsteren* Schweigen Kreons" (my italics). The word "finster" does not appear in the Greek text and Lesky here seems to have been influenced by the focalization of the Messenger, who throughout his story makes clear that he prefers a settlement through talk to fighting.

> A coward? Is it cowardly to fear what you know to be stronger than yourself? It is at any rate 'Realpolitik'. Eurystheus gave his last illustration of its principles when he refused Hyllus' challenge. After all, Hyllus is young and strong, and Eurystheus presumably older than old Iolaus. (Zuntz 35)

When Eurystheus finally enters the stage he proves — of course, to Grube's amazement — to be a "calm, dignified and brave man".
(3) Pohlenz 415 says of *Or.* 917-31:

> ein Bauer ... sieht in Orest den Wohltäter des Staates, ... und niemand weiß sachlich etwas dagegegen vorzubringen

He shows himself even more biased than the Messenger, paraphrasing in this tendentious manner the κοὐδεὶς ἔτ' εἶπε of the text (931).[142]

These three examples are in fact a tribute to the narrative art of the Euripidean messenger-speech: apparently so subtle as to pass unnoticed, it is at the same time so effective as to influence the paraphrases of scholars who are supposedly summarizing the bare facts of a play. The subjectivity of the Euripidean messenger-speech teaches us never to underrate the importance of focalization in narratives. Moreover, it also has a bearing on the interpretation of Euripidean drama at large, as the last section will show.

2.6 Conclusion. The messenger and the "open perspective structure" of Euripidean tragedy

In this chapter I have attempted to disprove the objectivity claim which regularly reappears in studies on the Euripidean messenger-speech. My method consisted in (1) analyzing the position of the messenger as character, narrator and focalizer; (2) discussing narrative techniques which reveal the messenger's focalization; and (3) examining the

[142] Willink gives another interpretation to these words: "despite 930, the issue is in the balance (poised between extremes) and the moment is ripe for a moderate speech for the defence ... but no one comes forward". Note that Lesky 469 too is inclined to favour the opinion of the Messenger ("Der Bote ist ein braver, dem Hause Agamemnon's anhänglicher Landmann, der aus seiner *gesunden* Sicht berichtet", my italics). Erdmann 124, n. 2 even goes one step further: "Gewiß ist der Bote parteilich für Orest, doch da er sachlich bleibt, darf man annehmen daß der Dichter aus ihm spricht."

reactions of his internal and external addressees. The Euripidean messenger — though not equipped with anything approaching a full characterization — plays a role in his own story. This story may thus be considered a first-person narrative, which in turn precludes a purely objective style. The discussion of the messenger's concluding evaluations, interspersed criticism and engagement, and his use of epithets, comparisons and denomination shows the ways in which he can make clear, with varying degrees of directness, his own feelings and opinions concerning the events he reports. His focalization is on the one hand a form of self-expression, and on the other a rhetorical weapon used to influence his addressees' emotions and opinions. Since he is literally "the one who sees", they are dependent upon him for their information and cannot but receive at the same time his accompanying evaluation of that information. Of course, they are never compelled to *share* that evaluation. In fact, more often than not the reaction of at least one of the addressees differs from that of the messenger, which further confirms that his is only one out of many possible presentations. A servant of Orestes would have told an entirely different story of the attack launched by his master and Pylades on Helen. The unsuccessful attack of the Seven against Thebes would have been reported very differently by a servant of, say, Adrastus. The facts would remain the same, the presentation would be different.

I conclude that the Euripidean messenger is neither an emotionless camera which registers off-stage events, nor the mouthpiece of the poet, but that he adds one more perspective to the range of views which together constitutes a Euripidean play. Seen in this light, the messenger-speech forms part of, and indeed manifestly contributes to, the "open perspective structure" of Euripidean drama. In plays with an open perspective structure, there is no one, dominant perspective which tells the spectators which side to choose.[143] Now if there is one thing on which all Euripidean scholars agree, it is this openness, the difficulty of grasping the 'meaning' of this author's plays:

[143] Pfister 67: "In plays with an open perspective structure, ..., there is no single line of convergence that might draw all ... perspectives together. The relationships between the figure-perspectives remain unclear, either because all control signals are omitted or because those that are not contradict one another."

> Dramatists, who speak through the masks of their creations, are notoriously difficult to pin down and Euripides more so than most. Euripides was a problem to his contemporaries and he is one still; over the course of the centuries since his plays were first produced he has been hailed or indicted under a bewildering variety of labels.[144]

Some scholars suggest we would do well not to attempt to pin down Euripides on a 'message', but rather accept that his plays "present no central meaning and persuade to nothing".[145] In Euripides' multiperspective drama, the messenger, who contributes a perspective of his own, is very much at home.

[144] Knox 317.
[145] Michelini 120.

CHAPTER THREE

NARRATIVE IN DRAMA

According to Aristotle *Poet.* 1449b24-7, an important characteristic of drama is that it proceeds through the mode of action and not of narration (μίμησις πράξεως ... δρώντων καὶ οὐ δι' ἀπαγγελίας). At first sight this would seem to imply that messenger-speeches, which are after all a form of ἀπαγγέλια, are not at home in drama. This conclusion is, however, unwarranted, since by δι' ἀπαγγελίας Aristotle means the assuming of the role of narrator *by the poet* (as Homer does in the narrator-text of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*). This indeed never happens in drama. What can and often does happen — not only in messenger-speeches, but also in Euripidean prologues and certain stichomythia — is that *dramatic characters* tell a story, whereby they assume the role of narrator.

This last chapter will examine more closely the narrative status of the messenger-speech and its relation to the dramatic context. Why are certain events narrated rather than shown, and what is the structural function of the messenger-speech (3.1)? In what respects are messenger-speeches drama (3.2), and in what respects narrative (3.3)? And what are the effects of this narrativity (3.4)?

3.1 Why messenger-speeches?

The messenger-speech grew out of the tradition in Attic drama that certain events are not shown on the stage. Why were certain events narrated rather than shown? In an article called "Why messenger-speeches?", Bremer 1976 discusses in detail the answers to this question which have been put forward from antiquity (Aristotle and scholiasts) onwards:[1]

1. The presence of the chorus makes scene-shifts practically impossible.
2. A chorus cannot act crowd-scenes.

[1] Cf. also Fischl 5-12, Henning 1-2, Erdmann 185-9, di Gregorio 25-33.

3. Miracles cannot be shown on stage.
4. Murder on stage is not feasible.

Although there are exceptions to each of these four rules, Bremer concludes that together they do indeed account for the phenomenon of the messenger-speech. The latter makes it possible to present (1) events taking place at a location other than that where the chorus happens to be, (2) crowd-scenes, (3) miracles, and (4) murders.[2] Bremer 42-4 further suggests that in addition to these technical, religious, and aesthetic reasons, messenger-speeches, which had probably been an important element of tragedy from the very beginning, may have been preserved out of sheer conservatism.

To these five reasons I would add one more:[3] messenger-speeches seem to have been highly appreciated by the audience, which may have led the competing playwrights to continue to incorporate them, indeed to devote much attention to them.[4] One indication that messenger-speeches were popular is the frequency with which scenes from messenger-speeches are illustrated on vases.[5] Another indication is provided by

[2] Note however that murders are not necessarily always presented in the form of a messenger-speech: thus the murders of the children of Medea (*Med.*), Lycus (*HF*), and Clytemnestra (*El.*) are not narrated, but overheard. See also Arnott 1982: 39-40.

[3] Walcot 32 mentions three factors: "what was convenient and what was traditional, and also what was, by the standards of the ancients, more effective dramatically". He bases the idea that telling was regarded as "dramatically more effective" than showing on the importance of the spoken word in fifth-century Athens. Ancient testimonia seem to contradict him on this point, however: see my discussion on p. 172.

[4] Cf. Erdmann 188: "Gewiß hat auch die Freude des Athener Publikums an der Eloquenz für die Länge und Häufigkeit der Botenberichte ihre Bedeutung"; Winnington-Ingram 1969: 140, n. 35: "... the audience liked messenger-speeches ..."; Stevens ad *Andr.* 1070-1165: "no doubt the audience settled down to enjoy these set pieces for themselves as well as for their contributions to the plot"; Willink 223-4, ad *Or.* 844-956: "One function of the 'Messenger-speech' here is to announce the verdict of the Argive assembly ... Another function, as a legacy from the epic tradition of poetic narrative, is *to entertain* and stir emotions of various kinds" (my italics); Barlow 1986: 14: "The Greeks delighted in narrative ... and such extended reports will have given special pleasures in themselves".

[5] More than half of the illustrations of Euripidean plays in Trendall & Webster concern messenger-speeches: iii.3,6-8 (*Alcmene*), 9 (*Andr.*), 14-5 (*Antiope*), 23-4 (*Hipp.*), 25 (*Hyps.*), 35 (*Med.*), 37-9 (*Meleager*), 47 (*Telephus*).

the parodies of messenger-scenes in comedy, e.g. Ar. *Av.* 1119ff., 1168ff. or Men. *Sicyonius* 176-271.

The extent to which the audience were accustomed to the person of the messenger is illustrated by the way Euripides plays with this expectation in *El.* A conversation between Electra and the coryphaeus precedes the arrival of the Messenger.[6] Electra is uncertain whether Orestes has succeeded in killing Aegisthus, and is contemplating suicide. The coryphaeus urges her to wait:

Ηλ. οὐκ ἔστι· νικώμεσθα· ποῦ γὰρ ἄγγελοι;
Χο. ἥξουσιν· οὔτοι βασιλέα φαῦλον κτανεῖν.

El. It cannot be; we are beaten — or where are our messengers?
Co. They will come. It is no small thing to kill a king.
(*El.* 759-60, transl. M.J. Cropp)

Electra's question and the coryphaeus' answer can be interpreted at two levels. The first level is that of the internal communication: Electra thinks that the attack on Aegisthus has failed and that Orestes and all his retainers have been killed (otherwise one of them would have come to bring news); the coryphaeus reassures her by saying that the messenger is simply late, since killing a king is not a matter of seconds. The second level is that of the external communication: Electra's question reflects the spectators' expectation that at this moment a messenger is due. Euripides replies (through the coryphaeus) that of course messengers will come, since the murder of a king is never passed over in drama without a messenger-speech.[7]

[6] As a rule a messenger enters immediately after a choral song. Other exceptions are: *Med.* (Medea speaks a few anxious words: 1116-20); *Andr.* (entrance of messenger preceded by conversation between Peleus and coryphaeus: 1047-69); *Hel.* (1) (conversation between Helen and Menelaus: 528-96. See for the exceptional form of this 'epeisodion' 528-1106: Kannicht 150); *Ph.* (3) + (4) (conversation between Creon and coryphaeus: 1310-34); *Or.* (1) (conversation between Electra and coryphaeus: 844-51); and *Ba.* (1) (conversation between Pentheus, 'stranger'/Dionysus and coryphaeus: 604-59). These intervening conversations, i.e., conversations which intervene between stasimon and messenger-scene, serve to heighten the tension or pathos.

[7] Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1969: 131-2 and Cropp ad *El.* 759. Other anticipations of the arrival of a messenger are: *Alc.* 79-85, *Heracl.* 748-54, and *Or.* 1359.

Given the conventional nature of the messenger-speech, the next question which presents itself is, what did Euripides do with this stock ingredient? The first thing to note here is that he apparently liked the messenger-speech, since he has one in every extant play (except *Tro.*) and two in his later plays. Moreover he also thoroughly integrates them into his plays in the following ways:

1. By motivating the messenger's activity as messenger: he comes to warn his internal addressees, or to announce the arrival of other characters, or is sent by others (see pp. 70-2).
2. By justifying the messenger's extension of a short 'news-bulletin' into a long story, even in cases where this length would seem inappropriate to the situation: his internal addressees ask him to tell them 'how' the event has come about (see pp. 32-3).
3. By giving the messenger-speech a clear function within the structure of the play.[8] Whereas Euripidean choral songs are occasionally only loosely connected with the action, his messenger-speeches are never digressions. This third point requires some elaboration.

The messenger-speech and the structure of the play

When referring to the function of the messenger-speech in the structure of a Euripidean play, it may be helpful to begin by looking at its *place* in the play:

	OCCURS IN
Alc.	first epeisodion
Med.	sixth epeisodion
Heracl.	fourth epeisodion
Hipp.	fourth epeisodion
Andr.	exodus
Hec.	second epeisodion
Supp.	third epeisodion
El.	third epeisodion
HF	fifth epeisodion

[8] Cf. Erdmann, who discusses not only the internal structure of each messenger-speech (a), but also its function in the play (b).

IT (1)	first epeisodion
IT (2)	exodus
Ion	fourth epeisodion
Hel. (1)	first epeisodion
Hel. (2)	exodus
Ph. (1) + (2)	fourth epeisodion
Ph. (3) + (4)	fifth epeisodion
Or. (1)	third epeisodion
Or. (2)	exodus
Ba. (1)	third epeisodion
Ba. (2)	exodus

It is clear from this overview that although Euripidean messenger-speeches tend to be found near the end of a play, they may occupy other positions as well. Accordingly, they may serve different structural functions:

1. Messenger-speeches with a preparatory function introduce characters or prepare for an action which will take place in the next scenes.[9] This category includes *Alc.*, *IT* (1), and *Ba.* (1).

2. Messenger-speeches with a concluding function recount the execution of an action which has been prepared for in preceding scenes. Of course, a concluding messenger-speech may also be relevant to what follows, but its ties with the foregoing are stronger. This category includes *Med.*, *Heracl.*, *Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *Supp.*, *El.*, *IT* (2), *Hel.* (2), *Ph.* (3) + (4), *Or.* (2), *Ba.* (2).

3. Messenger-speeches with a transitional function form the conclusion to an action previously set in motion, while at the same time engendering an important new action. This category includes *HF*, *Ion*, *Hel.* (1), *Ph.* (1) + (2), *Or.* (1).

The following analyses of the relationship between messenger-speech and play must necessarily be of a somewhat superficial nature, since to do otherwise would amount to analyzing in full the plot structure of each play. What I intend to do here is to show the extent and nature of the relationship between messenger-speech and play as a whole.

[9] Cf. Erdmann 103, who speaks of "die Funktion, Exposition der Handlung zu sein".

Messenger-speeches with preparatory function

Alc.: The messenger-speech paints a lively picture of Alcestis before she enters the stage in 244. We learn of her motive for the sacrifice (she feels that it is her duty); her accompanying feelings (she regrets her misfortune); and her concern for her children (163-9), which will determine to a large extent the way she behaves onstage (cf. especially 299-319).[10] But the messenger-speech also has a broader preparatory function. As we have seen (p. 107), it is the Messenger who first questions the value of her sacrifice, and this is the first step towards questioning the whole experiment of prolonging one's own life in exchange for that of another. And as Kullmann and Gregory 1979 have argued, to demonstrate the impossibility of this experiment was precisely the aim of this play.

IT (1): Although Orestes and Pylades have already made a brief appearance onstage (67-122), the messenger-speech serves to introduce them properly. We hear how Orestes has one of the fits of madness he mentioned in 79-84; how his friend Pylades loyally supports him; and how the two friends fight shoulder to shoulder against their Taurian opponents.[11] Pylades' loyalty will again play a role in 674-715, and Orestes and Pylades will once more have to demonstrate their physical prowess in *IT* (2), in particular 1364-78.

Ba. (1): The messenger-speech gives the first full description of the Theban Maenads on Mt. Cithaeron, of whom Dionysus spoke briefly in the Prologue (32-8). The *sparagmos*-scene, in particular, prepares for what is to come in *Ba.* (2).[12] Thus the two messenger-speeches of *Ba.* may be seen as a pair of "mirror-scenes".[13] In point of fact, *Ba.* (1) is the last of a series of warnings given by Dionysus to Pentheus.[14] This

[10] See also my more detailed analysis on pp. 150-1.

[11] Note that the action of this messenger-speech is briefly foreshadowed in 106-9: κρύψωμεν δέμας κατ' ἄντρ' ἃ πόντος νοτίδι διακλύζει μέλας νεὼς ἄπωθεν, μή τις εἰσιδὼν σκάφος βασιλεῦσιν εἴπῃ κᾆτα ληφθῶμεν βίᾳ.

[12] Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1948: 88, 96, 129-30, n. 4; Roux 476, ad 735-6; Taplin 1978: 57.

[13] See for this concept Taplin 1978: 122-37.

[14] Earlier warnings are the 'conversion' of Cadmus and Tiresias (170-369), the miraculous escape of the Maenads (443-8), the words and behaviour of the 'stranger' (461-518), and the palace 'miracles' (576-641): Burnett 1970: 20-3, Taplin 1978:

is clear from the special way in which the entrance of the Messenger is announced by the god:[15]

> κείνου δ' ἀκούσας πρῶτα τοὺς λόγους μάθε,
> ὃς ἐξ ὄρους πάρεστιν ἀγγελῶν τί σοι
>
> But first listen to and learn from the words of that man, who is present from the mountains to report you something
>
> (*Ba*. 657-8)

The violent reaction of the Maenads to the intrusion of the herdsmen should have dissuaded Pentheus from following the example of his men.

Messenger-speeches with concluding function

The messenger-speeches in *Med.*, *Andr.*, *El.*, *IT* (2), *Hel.* (2), *Or.* (2), and *Ba.* (2) all recount the outcome of an intrigue (*mechanema*),[16] whereby their content is anticipated during the onstage-planning or announcement of the intrigue. In the case of *Or.* (2), for example, the double intrigue against Helen and Hermione is planned by Orestes, Pylades, and Electra in 1098-1224,[17] and at certain points the planning and the execution (as reported by the Messenger) show a high degree of correspondance:

Planning: 1119	Πυ. ἔσιμεν ἐς οἴκους δῆθεν ὡς θανούμενοι. Py. we'll go into the house pretending we're going to kill ourselves. (transl. M.L. West)
Execution: 1400-1	Φρ. ἦλθον ἐς δόμους ... λέοντες Ἕλλανες δύο διδύμω Phr. There came into the house ... lions of Greece, a matching pair
Planning: 1121	Πυ. γόους πρὸς αὐτὴν θησόμεσθ' ἃ πάσχομεν. Py. We'll cry and make moan to her of our plight.

157-8.

[15] See Taplin 1978: 57.

[16] For *mechanema* messenger-speeches, see Appendix A, pp. 180-1.

[17] The intrigue of *Med.* is announced in 774-89, of *Andr.* announced in 995-1008, of *El.* planned in 598-639, of *IT* (2) planned in 1017-55, of *Hel.* (2) planned in 1033-92, of *Ba.* (2) 'planned' in 810-61.

Execution: 1408-15	Φρ. οἳ δὲ πρὸς θρόνους ἔσω μολόντες ... ὄμμα δακρύοις πεφυρμένοι, ταπεινὸι ἕζονθ' ... περὶ δὲ γόνυ χέρας ἱκεσίους ἔβαλον ἔβαλον Ἑλένας ἄμφω. Phr. They came in to the seat ... their faces blurred with tears and crouched all humble, ... and flung, both flung their suppliant arms round Helen's knees.
Planning: 1125	Πυ. κρύπτ' ἐν πέπλοισι τοισίδ' ἕξομεν ξίφη. Py. Concealed in these robes we'll have swords.
Execution: 1457-8	Φρ. ἀμφιπορφυρέων πέπλων ὑπὸ σκότου ξίφη σπάσαντες ... ἐν χεροῖν Phr. with swords in their hands drawn from the shadow of purple-bordered robes
Planning: 1127	Πυ. ἐκκλῄσομεν σφᾶς ἄλλον ἄλλοσε στέγης. Py. we'll shut them [Phrygian attendants] out in different parts of the building.
Execution: 1448	Φρ. ἔκλῃσε δ' ἄλλον ἄλλοσ' ἐν στέγαισι Phr. And he shut us up in different parts of the buildings
Planning: 1212-3	Ορ. ὡς τἄλλα γ' εἶπας, εἴπερ εὐτυχήσομεν, κάλλισθ', ἑλόντες σκύμνον ἀνοσίου πατρός. Or. I mean, all you've said is excellent, provided we can succeed in catching this cub of an unholy father.
Execution: 1492-3	Φρ. ἄθυρσοι δ' οἷά νιν δραμόντε Βάκχαι σκύμνον ἐν χεροῖν ὀρείαν ξυνήρπασαν Phr. Like Bacchants at a mountain cub (lacking only the thyrsus) they ran and seized her in their grip

If we compare the planning and the Phrygian's reporting, the latter's exuberant narrative style emerges all the more clearly: his use of metaphor ("lions of Greece"), comparison ("like Bacchants at a mountain cub"), *geminatio* ("flung ... flung"), and epithet ("purple-bordered").

Some *mechanema* messenger-speeches are anticipated more than once and in great detail, others only fleetingly. Thus at the one extreme we have the messenger-speech in *Med.* which is anticipated in:

(1) 774-89 (Medea: chorus): I will (make up with Jason and) send my children with gifts to the princess, which I have before prepared with poison.[18]
(2) 947-75 (Medea: Jason): I will send our children with gifts to your bride, which are the most beautiful in the world.[19]
(3) 978-88 (chorus): the princess will for sure accept the gifts and she is already as good as dead.
(4) 1002-4 (Paedagogus: Medea): the princess has gladly accepted the gifts.
(5) 1065-6 (Medea: chorus): the princess is dying.

(1) and (2) are regular parts of the structure of a Euripidean *mechanema*: 774-89 is the onstage announcement, 947-75 the onstage execution.[20] An anticipation by the chorus (3) is in itself not unusual,[21] but its visionary detail here is equalled — if not surpassed — only by *Ba*. 977-1023.[22] (4) is a kind of mini messenger-speech. In 1136-57 the real Messenger will repeat, in far more detail, the information provided by the Paedagogus. (5) belongs to Medea's famous monologue 1019-80,[23] in which she is torn apart by the horrible task awaiting her. The imminent and inescapable completion of the first part of her intrigue (the death of Jason's bride) brings closer the other part (the infanticide). It is, of course, precisely this close relationship between the first and second parts of the intrigue which explains the repeated anticipation of the

[18] Note that Creon's death is not announced specifically by Medea in 788: [the princess] κακῶς ὀλεῖται πᾶς θ' ὃς ἂν θίγῃ κόρης. For pre-phases of Medea's scheme for vengeance, see 163-5, 260-2, 384-5.

[19] Note the heavy irony of εὐδαιμονήσει (952), μακαρίᾳ (957), οὔτοι ... μεμπτά (958).

[20] For the tripartite structure of the Euripidean *mechanema* (onstage planning or announcement, onstage execution, offstage execution reported by the messenger), see Appendix A, p. 181.

[21] Cf. *Heracl*. 748-83, *Supp*. 598-633 ("E. simulates tense anticipation of the battle's outcome, and the Messenger's vivid description, by forming the stasimon into an anxious dialogue between hemichoria": Collard 1975: 264), *HF* 875-85, *Ion* 1048-73, *Ph*. 1284-1306, *Or*. 1353-65.

[22] Cf. Dodds 198, ad 977-1032: the chorus "describe in clairvoyant vision what shall happen, or is even now happening, somewhere in the mountains."

[23] Some scholars delete 1056-80.

messenger-speech. In fact the messenger-speech may itself be seen as a preparation for the second part of the intrigue, the infanticide.[24]

At the other extreme, we find the messenger-speech in *Andr.*, where in 995-1008 Orestes is deliberately vague about his plot against Neoptolemus in Delphi: [μηχανή] ... ἣν πάρος μὲν οὐκ ἐρῶ (997). We hear only of armed allies (999: δορυξένων), slander (1005: διαβολαῖς ... ταῖς ἐμαῖς), and Apollo taking part in the plot (1002-8). It remains the task of the Messenger to tell us the details of these and other elements. See for the armed allies: 1098-9, 1114, 1118; for Orestes' slander: 1090-5, 1109-11; and for Apollo's complicity: 1147-9, 1161-5.

But of course the anticipation of a *mechanema* messenger-speech is never complete, not only because no character can possibly foresee everything (least of all the outcome of the intrigue), but also because this would take the edge off the messenger-speech itself. Thus in the case of *El.* only the first phase of the coup against Aegisthus is discussed beforehand: a way of getting close to him (621-38). The rest is left open:

> Πρ. τοὐνθένδε πρὸς τὸ πῖπτον αὐτὸς ἐννόει.
>
> Old Man. From there you must plan yourself, as the dice may fall.
> (*El.* 639, transl. M.J. Cropp)[25]

It remains for the Messenger to relate how Orestes adopted the strategy of pretending to be a Thessalian, and coolly awaited the right moment to slay Aegisthus.[26]

Things may also turn out differently. Very differently, as in the case of Creusa's intrigue against Ion — which fails — or only slightly

[24] Cf. Gellie 1988: 21 ("For the first time within the play we see that Medea's ugly reputation is deserved, and the two deaths give us a foretaste of the play's climax") and De Jong 1990: 90 ("She [Creon's daughter] is made a focal character, because her death is the prelude to that even more horrible murder, viz. of Medea's children"). As Buttrey 9-10, n. 14 suggests, the fate of Creon losing his child (1204-10) prepares for Jason's loss of his children (1323ff.).

[25] Cf. *IT* 1051 (σοὶ δὴ μέλειν χρὴ τἄλλ' ὅπως ἕξει καλῶς) and *Ba.* 976 (τἄλλα δ' αὐτὸ σημανεῖ), where further anticipation of the messenger-speech is also cut short.

[26] It has been noted that both here and in *Or.* Orestes behaves onstage extremely hesitantly during the planning and has to be coached and spurred on by others, whereas at the moment of offstage action he is self-assured and decisive.

differently, as in *El.*, where the Old Man announces that Orestes will not be recognized by Aegisthus' retainers (631), whereas in fact he is (852-3), though at a moment when this can no longer harm him. On the contrary, it confirms his real identity, which he has just revealed.

I turn now to the other concluding messenger-speeches, which do not concern *mechanema* plots.

Heracl.: The messenger-speech describes the outcome of the military confrontation between the Heraclids, aided by the Athenians, and their arch-enemy Eurystheus. This confrontation had first been announced by the Argive herald (275-83), and is later referred to by Demophon (335-7) and the chorus (371-80, 748-83). One particular part of the messenger-speech, Iolaus' miraculous rejuvenation and his capture of Eurystheus (853-63), had been prefigured by Iolaus' onstage prayer in 740-4. Note in particular the echo of ὦ βραχίων ... ἡβήσαντά σε (740) in νέων βραχιόνων ἔδειξεν ἡβητὴν τύπον (857-8).

Hipp.: The messenger-speech describes the fulfilment of Theseus' curse against Hippolytus. The curse had been mentioned by Aphrodite in the Prologue (43-6). Theseus curses his son in 887-90 (ἡμέραν δὲ μὴ φύγοι τήνδ'), in the latter's absence. To be on the safe side,[27] he also exiles his son in 893, and thus he outlines in 895-8 two different fates for Hippolytus: either he dies by the curse or he spends the rest of his life as a wandering exile. Face to face with Hippolytus, Theseus repeats the sentence of exile (1048-9), but not the curse,[28] and the chorus reflect only on the exile (1102-50). Thus from 898 onwards the curse recedes into the background, so that the effect of the messenger-speech, describing its terrible fulfilment, is all the greater.[29] Note how Hippolytus' offstage prayer in 1191 (μηκέτ' εἴην εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ) reflects the words he spoke onstage in 1028-31 (ὀλοίμην ... εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνήρ).[30]

Hec.: The messenger-speech concludes the Polyxena action, making way for the Polydorus action. Both actions had been announced in the

[27] As Barrett ad 887-90 argues, this is the first time Theseus has used one of the three curses, and he may be uncertain about their efficacy.

[28] For the question of Hippolytus' unexplained knowledge of the curse in 1241, see above p. 58.

[29] See Barrett ad 887-9.

[30] For a discussion of Hippolytus' prayer/curse/oath (1028-31), see Segal 1972.

Prologue by the ghost of Polydorus: Polyxena: 35-44, Polydorus: 45-52. Note how Polyxena's offstage words in 547-52 echo, without exactly repeating, those she spoke onstage in 342-78.[31]

Supp.: The messenger-speech describes the outcome of the military confrontation between Athens, which supports the cause of the suppliant women, and the Thebans. Thus it concludes the first half of this play, the recovery of the bodies. From the beginning, two possible ways of settling the dispute over the return of the bodies, with words or by force, had been mentioned: by Aethra (ἢ λόγοισιν ἢ δορὸς ῥώμῃ: 24-6), by Theseus (λόγοισι ... βίᾳ δορός: 346-8, and cf. 385-94, 558-60), and by the chorus (διὰ δορὸς ... ἢ λόγων ξυναλλαγαῖς: 602). The Messenger starts with a report of Theseus' last effort to procure a peaceful settlement, i.e. a settlement through words (669-72). It is, however, force which decides the matter.

Ph. (3) + (4): The messenger-speeches describe the final outcome of the military confrontation between Polyneices (+ Argives) and Eteocles (+ Thebans), both on the individual level (the two brothers kill each other in a duel), and on the collective level (the Thebans rout the Argives: 1472-5); as well as Jocasta's suicide (announced in 1282, if her sons should die). The messenger-speeches for the greater part continue and conclude the action begun in *Ph.* (1) + (2) (see pp. 129-30). Note that the chorus in 1284-1306 anticipate the death of the brothers.

Messenger-speeches with transitional function

Ion: The messenger-speech describes the unsuccessful outcome of Creusa's intrigue against Ion, which she planned onstage in 978-1038. At the same time it recounts the beginning of a new action, in which Ion takes his revenge on Creusa. This new action will bring the two together in 1261ff., thereby pointing the way to the recognition (1437-42).

HF: The messenger-speech describes the outcome of the divine *mechanema* (planned by Hera, announced (822-74) and executed by Iris

[31] The point in common is Polyxena's acceptance of the sacrifice, but the emphasis is different: in 342-78 she declares herself ready to die because, after the change from princess into slave, life no longer has anything to offer her (νῦν δ' εἰμὶ δούλη); in 547-52 she emphasizes that her readiness to die makes her a free person and that she will thus keep her royal status among the dead (βασιλὶς οὖσ').

and Lyssa) against Heracles, which consists in making him kill his children and wife during a fit of madness. The messenger-speech forms the transition from the first part of the play, in which Heracles is hailed as a divine hero, to the second part, in which he becomes a vulnerable, mortal man again.[32]

Hel. (1): The messenger-speech describes the disappearance of the phantom Helen, and thereby makes the reunion of Menelaus and the real Helen a fact (622-4).

Ph. (1) + (2): The messenger-speeches tell of Menoeceus' sacrifice, the first phase of the battle between Thebans and Argives, and the preparations for the duel between Polyneices and Eteocles. Menoeceus' sacrifice had been ordered by Teiresias in 913-4 and decided upon by Menoeceus himself in 1009-12. A violent confrontation between the two brothers, and their armies, had been prophesied in general terms by Oedipus, who cursed them (θηκτῷ σιδήρῳ δῶμα διαλαχεῖν τόδε: 67-8); was imminent even before the play began (cf. Jocasta in the Prologue: 77-80); and despite Jocasta's efforts to avert it, was coming ever closer. In the central agon the brothers announced their intention to confront each other during battle (621-2, 635), and in 754-6 Eteocles again made it clear, this time to Creon, that he hoped to face his brother. In 880 Teiresias prophesied the death of the brothers, each at the hand of the other. All this might have led the spectators to expect an Aeschylean confrontation at the seventh gate, which, however, does not take place (see pp. 157-6). The two brothers do not meet on the battlefield and in the end they decide to confront each other in a duel, during a truce. This idea of letting the brothers kill each other in a

[32] A convincing analysis of *HF* is given by Gregory 1977, who argues that the play centres on Heracles' double fatherhood (mortal and divine). For the transitional position of the messenger-speech, cf. in particular: "At the opening of the play his divine inheritance seems to prevail ... In the middle of the play we are shown Heracles gone mad, transformed into something less than human. In the third part the hero, restored to his senses, must reassess his view of himself. He realizes that he is no longer semi-divine but all too mortal ..." (261). Cf. also Foley 1985: 176 ("He [Heracles] retains his past glory, yet by his crime and suffering he has been reduced to equality with other men, and in this sense becomes a true participant in a democratic society").

Homeric duel of the type fought by Paris and Menelaus (*Il.* 3) or Ajax and Hector (*Il.* 7) is a Euripidean innovation.[33]

Or. (1): The messenger-speech reports the trial which the Argives had started of the murderers of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. Its negative outcome for Orestes and Electra will lead to their desperate intrigue to revenge themselves on Helen. The trial — another Euripidean innovation — had been mentioned for the first time by Electra in the Prologue (48-51), and was referred to again by Orestes (440, 442), Tyndareus (536, 612-4, 625), and Pylades (730-1). In 774-806 Orestes and Pylades decide to attend the trial in person. Orestes' offstage speech (932-42) reflects in part his onstage one, addressed to Tyndareus (544-604). He chooses to repeat the 'public benefit' argument: killing a woman who has killed her husband benefits the whole of Greece, since it sets a standard.[34]

Conclusion

This survey of the structural functions of the Euripidean messenger-speech — preparatory, concluding, and transitional — shows how firmly they are anchored in the plays. Preparatory messenger-speeches introduce characters and actions; concluding and transitional messenger-speeches contribute in no small way to the development of the plot. The situation after a concluding or transitional messenger-speech is radically different from the situation before. To take only the more dramatic examples: in the messenger-speech in *HF* Heracles goes from saviour to destroyer of his family; in *Hec.* Polyxena becomes from victim 'victor'; while in *Ba.* (2) Pentheus changes from hunter to prey and from spectator to spectacle. All three types of messenger-speech contain elements which had either been mentioned before, or will be mentioned later (e.g. onstage planning or announcement and offstage execution of an intrigue, or offstage speeches echoing onstage ones: *Hipp.* 1191≈1028-31; *Hec.* 547-52≈342-78; *Or.* 932-42≈544-604).

[33] Note the recurrence of typical Homeric duel elements: silence (*Il.* 3.82-5, 7.55-6, *Ph.* 1224); challenge (3.86-94, 7.67-91, 1225-35); acceptance (3.97-110, -, 1236-7); truce and sacrifice (3.264-313, -, 1240-1); and arming (3.328-38, 7.206-13, 1242-7). Said 517, n. 98 points out the similarities (between *Ph.* (3) and *Il.* 7) in the stages of fighting (spears, stones, swords). Cf. also Foley 1985: 129.

[34] A good analysis is given by Eucken, esp. 159-60 and 163.

Having examined the place and the functions of the messenger-speech within the dramatic context of the play, I will now return to the messenger-speech itself. By way of preparation for the comparison of narrative and drama soon to be undertaken, I will first look at its dramatic qualities.

3.2 The messenger-speech as drama

In Chapter 1 we have encountered one dramatic feature of the Euripidean messenger-speech, viz. the frequent use of historic presents. The messenger's predilection for this form of presentation comes from his habit of narrating according to his experiencing focalization (above p. 30), i.e. his focalization of the moment of experiencing rather than that of narration. The general effect of historic presents is vividness: the messenger's addressees are drawn into the story and invited to place themselves mentally — as does the messenger himself — into the situation being recounted.

Another dramatic feature is the high incidence of direct speech.

Direct speech

All scholars dealing with the Euripidean messenger-speech have noted how often the messenger includes direct speech;[35] this is interpreted as a technique to increase the vividness and drama of the messenger-speech. The characters quoted actually seem to be speaking.[36] A high incidence of direct speech is also typical of the Homeric epics — which

[35] See Bassi 88, Fischl 36-7, Henning 36-8, Erdmann 79-82, Schmid-Stählin 777, n. 4, and Burgess 30-3. An inventory of direct and indirect speech is given in Appendix H.

[36] Cf. Bassi 88 ("I discorsi testuali, ..., rendono più drammatico il racconto"), Fischl 36, and Erdmann 79 ("Anschauligkeit und Lebendigkeit"), 81-2 ("es scheint gerechtfertigt, auch dieses Element der Botenrhesis als dramatisches zu nennen"). Page's remark ad *Med.* 1141 ("The Ἀγγελίαι are the least dramatic parts of the drama: they are full of description, and while they are spoken the action of the play is at a standstill") shows a curious insensibility to the dramatic qualities of the messenger-speech. Of course, the quotation of speeches is also meant by the messenger to enhance the authenticity of his story: Erdmann 79, Collard 1975: 279, Müller-Goldingen 188.

for this reason have been called 'dramatic'.[37] In this respect Euripides is the most Homeric of the Attic tragedians, making use of direct speech every 21 lines, as opposed to every 167 lines for Aeschylus, and every 47 for Sophocles.[38]

The length of a direct speech can vary from two words (Ὤμοι μοι in *Or.* 1465 or Ἅλις μοι in *Hel.* 1581) to 10 verses (*HF* 936-46, *Ph.* 1225-35, *Or.* 932-42), the average length being two verses. The messenger-speech with the highest number of speeches is that in *El.*: 11 different speeches, which together take up some 35 verses out of a total of 84. Euripides even includes dialogues, a technique not found in Aeschylean or Sophoclean messenger-speeches:

ἰδὼν δ' ἀυτεῖ· Χαίρετ', ὦ ξένοι· τίνες
πόθεν πορεύεσθ' ἔστε τ' ἐκ ποίας χθονός;
ὁ δ' εἶπ' Ὀρέστης· Θεσσαλοί· πρὸς δ' Ἀλφεὸν
θύσοντες ἐρχόμεσθ' Ὀλυμπίῳ Διί.
κλύων δὲ ταῦτ' Αἴγισθος ἐννέπει τάδε·

Seeing us he [Aegisthus] called out, "Greetings, strangers. Who are you, whence do you journey, and what is your homeland?" Orestes replied, "Thessalians; we are going to the Alpheus, to offer sacrifice to Olympian Zeus." And hearing this Aegisthus then declared:
(*El.* 779-83, transl. M.J. Cropp)[39]

At one climactic point in the action the Messenger of *El.* even leaves out the speech-introduction and -capping and we have a real *amoibaion*:

χὼ μὲν σκυθράζει, δεσπότης δ' ἀνιστορεῖ·
Τί χρῆμ' ἀθυμεῖς; Ὦ ξέν', ὀρρωδῶ τινα
δόλον θυραῖον.

[37] See De Jong 1987a: 20.

[38] Aeschylean and Sophoclean messenger-speeches have more indirect than direct speech: 16 versus 10 (while the figures for Euripides are 30 versus 84). The instances of direct speech are: A. *Pers.* 402-5, *Th.* 580-9; S. *Aj.* 756-7, 762-79 (with other direct speeches embedded: 764-5, 767-9, 774-5), *Ant.* 1211-8, 1228-30, *Tr.* 797-802, 920-2, *OC* 1611-9, 1627-8, 1631-5, 1640-4.

[39] Other examples: *Andr.* 1104-5 + 1106-8, *El.* 791-2 + 793-6, 831 + 831-3 + 834-7, *Hel.* 1579-80 + 1581, *Or.* 875-6 + 877-8.

Aegisthus scowled, but my master enquired: "What puts you out of temper?" — "Stranger, I dread some alien guile."

(*El.* 830-2, transl. M.J. Cropp)[40]

Quoting freely the words of Orestes and Aegisthus, the Messenger seems to savour the way his master is leading Aegisthus up the garden path — his own garden, at that! While consumed by fear of Orestes,[41] Aegisthus invites, no, drags, his arch-enemy into his house (784-9), and even offers him a murder-weapon himself:

Ἓν τῶν καλῶν κομποῦσι τοῖσι Θεσσαλοῖς
εἶναι τόδ', ὅστις ταῦρον ἀρταμεῖ καλῶς
ἵππους τ' ὀχμάζει· λαβὲ σίδηρον, ὦ ξένε,
δεῖξόν τε φήμην ἔτυμον ἀμφὶ Θεσσαλῶν.

"The men of Thessaly, so they boast, excel in butchering a bull, and also in breaking horses. Take a knife, stranger, and prove the saying about the Thessalians true."

(*El.* 815-8, transl. M.J. Cropp)

For his part, Orestes provides instances of conscious irony alongside the unconscious ones of Aegisthus:

εἰ δὲ ξένους ἀστοῖσι συνθύειν χρεών,
Αἴγισθ', ἕτοιμοι κοὐκ ἀπαρνούμεσθ', ἄναξ.

"If strangers may join with citizens in sacrificing, Aegisthus, we are ready and do not decline, my lord."

(*El.* 795-6, transl. M.J. Cropp)

and

Φυγάδος δῆτα δειμαίνεις δόλον,
πόλεως ἀνάσσων;

[40] Cf. Denniston ad 831: "The unintroduced answer is vivid, and, though I know of no parallel, not to be suspected." There is in fact a parallel: *Or.* 1447, for which cf. West *ad loc.*: "the absence of a verb of speaking is extraordinary. Possibly something has fallen out, but there is no unclarity".

[41] Cf. in the messenger-speech itself 831-3, as well as earlier 22-3, 25-6, 39, 617.

> "So you fear foul play from a fugitive", Orestes said, "you, the lord of the city?"
>
> (*El.* 834-5, transl. M.J. Cropp)

The irony in 795-6 is contained in the juxtaposition of 'strangers' and 'citizens', the use of Aegisthus' name and the title 'my lord' (and the position of name and title at a distance);[42] in 834-5 in the particle δῆτα,[43] and the contrast between 'fugitive' and 'lord of the city'.

According to Erdmann 79, direct speeches are invariably found at "dramatisch bedeutsame Stellen". Here we have the same problem as in the case of the historic presents:[44] direct speeches also occur at less important points (e.g. Talthybius asking for silence in *Hec.* 532-3);[45] conversely, other speeches which to us seem important are not quoted in full (e.g. that of the third herdsman in *IT* 276-8). Here, as in the case of the historic presents,[46] we must keep in mind that it is the *speaker* (the messenger) who decides what is important and thus whom and what he will quote or not quote. The fact that a messenger-speech does not necessarily record all that has been said, in other words is not a kind of tape-recording,[47] is illustrated by *Or.* We first overhear Helen shouting the following words:

> Ελ. <ἔνδοθεν> ἰὼ Πελασγὸν Ἄργος, ὄλλυμαι κακῶς.
> Hel. <cry within> Oyé, Pelasgian Argos, I am perishing fully!
>
> Ελ. <ἔνδοθεν> Μενέλαε, θνῄσκω· σὺ δὲ παρὼν μ' οὐκ ὠφελεῖς.
> Hel. <cry within> Menelaus, I'm DYING, and you're not here to help me!
>
> (*Or.* 1296, 1301, transl. M.L. West)

[42] Cf. Cropp ad 796: "perhaps with irony in the use of Aeg.'s name ... The separation of ἄναξ, my lord, can also have ironic effect."

[43] Denniston 1954 does not register an ironic use of δῆτα, while LSJ does (s.v. δῆτα 2).

[44] See pp. 39-40.

[45] This had been noticed by Fischl 36: "Interdum etiam inde, quod nuntius gravia, quae audivit, verba a levioribus secernere non potest et haec non minus quam illa fideliter reddit, illustris fit narratio".

[46] Above p. 41.

[47] Nor is it, to use another anachronistic comparison, a camera registration (above p. 115).

In his report the Messenger does not quote these words, but does quote others:

> Φρ. ἃ δ' ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν· Ὤμοι μοι.
> Phr. She screamed aloud, screamed "O woe, woe!"
> (*Or.* 1465, transl. M.L. West)

This is one of the few places where we can, as it were, verify the 'reporting' activity of the Messenger; we see here that he does not indeed report everything.[48] In the following analysis I will try to indicate the criteria the Euripidean messenger uses in quoting speeches.

In the first place, he seems to do so when it concerns words spoken by himself or one of his colleagues. Thus Talthybius quotes his own words in *Hec.* 532-3, and the Messenger of *HF* quotes the puzzled reaction of his fellow-servants in *HF* 952.[49]

In the second place, there are what may be considered conventional speeches, such as the military exhortation (*parainesis*) which since Homer has been part of the 'genre' battle description. For example:

> Ὦ τὰς Ἀθήνας — Ὦ τὸν Ἀργείων γύην
> σπείροντες — οὐκ ἀρήξετ' αἰσχύνην πόλει;
>
> "You men of Athens — you who plough the soil of Argos — save your city from disgrace!"
> (*Heracl.* 839-40, transl. P. Vellacott)[50]

[48] Compare also *HF* 886-909 (Amphitryon's cries from within) with 965-7 (Messenger's report). Incorrectly Barlow 1982: 120: "*Nothing is left out* ... the supposed conversations of the servants, Amphitryon, Megara, the children, and the hero himself are faithfully reported *word for word* as the action builds up" (my italics).

[49] Other examples: *IT* 267-8, 270-4 (speeches of the Messenger's fellow-herdsmen), 1358-60 (Messenger's fellow-sailors); *Hel.* 1589-91 (one of the Messenger's fellow-sailors); *Or.* 875-6 (Messenger speaking himself); *Ba.* 718-21 (Messenger's fellow-herdsman).

[50] Other examples of paraenetic speeches: *Heracl.* 826-7; *Supp.* 702, 711-2; *Hel.* 1593-5, 1597-9, 1603-4; *Ph.* 1145-7, 1250-1, 1252-3; and cf. A. *Pers.* 402-5. For the epic antecedents of this type of speech, see Collard 1975: 288-9, ad 694-717 and Müller-Goldingen 183. Other conventional types of speech are the prayer preceding a duel: *Ph.* 1365-8, 1373-6 (cf. *Il.* 3.350-4 and 7.202-5, and see note 33); the prayer preceding a sacrifice: *Hec.* 534-41 (cf. *Il.* 3.276-91); and the invitation to speak at a trial: *Or.* 885-7.

Note that the Messenger has taken the liberty of combining what in fictional reality must have been two speeches, one by an Athenian and another by an Argive general.

In the third place, the messenger quotes speeches which are an indispensable part of the story, that is, speeches which contain information which is essential to an understanding of the development of the action. Thus Orestes' speech in *Andr.* 1092-5 contains the slander (announced in 1005) which causes Neoptolemus' downfall; Eteocles' speech in *Ph.* 1225-35 contains the proposal to fight a duel.[51]

In the fourth place, the messenger may quote speeches to increase the pathos of his story. Considering the catastrophic content of most messenger-speeches, this is quite often the case. Two examples:

> (Jocasta: Polyneices and Eteocles)
> Ὦ τέκν', ὑστέρα βοηδρόμος
> πάρειμι.
>
> "My children, too late as helper am I here."
> (*Ph.* 1432-3, transl. E. Craik)

and

> (Pentheus: Agave)
> Ἐγώ τοι, μῆτερ, εἰμί, παῖς σέθεν
> Πενθεύς, ὃν ἔτεκες ἐν δόμοις Ἐχίονος·
> οἴκτιρε δ' ὦ μῆτέρ με, μηδὲ ταῖς ἐμαῖς
> ἁμαρτίαισι παῖδα σὸν κατακτάνῃς.

[51] Other examples: *Med.* 1151-5 (Jason makes the request which Medea asked for in 942-3); *HF* 936-46 (Heracles' words contain the clue to the deranged acts which follow); *IT* 285-91 (stranger's words make clear the nature of his madness), 1361-3 (Orestes reveals his identity), 1386-9 (mysterious exhortation of the Greeks), 1398-1402 (Iphigeneia's prayer to Artemis); *Ion* 1128-31 (Xuthus' speech contains the suggestion that a tent be built, in 651-5 and 663-5 he had only mentioned the banquet), 1178-80 (the Old Man's words form part of the execution of the intrigue against Ion: his suggestion to change cups allows him to smuggle in the cup given him by Creusa, which contains the poisoned wine: 1029-36); *Hel.* 608-15 (farewell speech of Helen's phantom, for its ambiguities, see Kannicht 168-9), 1584-7 (Menelaus reveals his identity); *Ba.* 731-3 (Agave opens the hunt for the herdsmen), 1059-62 (Pentheus' delusion), 1079-81 (Dionysus opens the hunt for Pentheus), 1106-9 (Agave's delusion).

"Look, it is I, mother, your child Pentheus, whom you bore in the house of Echion. Take pity on me, mother, and do not by reason of my errors murder your own child."

(*Ba.* 1118-21, transl. G.S. Kirk)[52]

As befits such a tragic appeal, Pentheus' words are to no avail and his mother kills him without knowing what she is doing.

In the fifth place, the messenger may choose to quote a character's words because they underscore his own 'message'.[53] Thus the Messenger of *Hipp.*, who wants to convince his addressee Theseus of Hippolytus' innocence, quotes Hippolytus no fewer than three times (1182-4, 1191-3, 1240-2). In this way he allows his master to twice affirm his innocence (1192: ἡμᾶς ὡς ἀτιμάζει πατήρ, 1242: ἄνδρ' ἄριστον), and once show his obedience, in spite of everything, to his father (1182: πειστέον πατρὸς λόγοις). Similarly, the Messenger of *Andr.*, loyal servant to Neoptolemus, twice quotes his master setting out his good intentions in coming to Delphi (1106-8, 1125-6), while the Messenger of *El.* extensively quotes Orestes' speech to Aegisthus' retainers, in which he explains his motive for killing Aegisthus (847-51). The Messenger of *Hel.* (2), who wishes to make clear how he, or rather Theoclymenus, had been fooled by Menelaus, quotes the latter's deceitful speeches (1543-6, 1560-4).[54]

One particularly subtle way of handling the narrative instrument of direct speech is by quoting some persons directly, and others only

[52] Other examples: *Alc.* 163-9 (Alcestis praying to Hestia), 177-82 (Alcestis addressing her bridal bed); *Med.* 1207-10 (Creon lamenting his daughter; note the irony of συνθάνοιμι); *Hec.* 547-52, 563-5 (Polyxena heroically facing death); *HF* 965-7, 975-6, 988-9 (Heracles' victims bidding him to stop); *Ph.* 1436-7 (Antigone lamenting her brothers), 1444-53 (dying words of Polyneices). Ion's speeches (*Ion* 1210-2 and 1220-1) are not so much the pathetic as the dramatic highlights of this messenger-speech.

[53] For the messenger's own message, see Ch. 2, pp. 106-7.

[54] Other examples: *Heracl.* 804-10 (the speech brings out Hyllus' courage); *Hec.* 577-80 (speech gives expression to the Greek admiration for Polyxena); *Supp.* 669-72 (Theseus tries one last time to obtain a peaceful settlement); *HF* 982-3 (Heracles' gloating over the death of his own son makes clear the tragic delusion from which he is suffering); *IT* 321-2 (stranger's words illustrate his courage), *Or.* 932-42 (Orestes is given the chance to defend his cause), 1438-43 (Orestes' deceiving speech), 1447, 1461-4 (Orestes' and Pylades' aggression). Many of the speeches listed in this fifth category also belong to the fourth (pathetic) category.

indirectly.[55] Thus the Messenger of *Or.* (1), who is a loyal supporter of Orestes and Electra, quotes directly only Orestes' speech at the trial (932-42), while those of the other speakers are quoted indirectly (889-93, 899-900, 914-6, 923-9);[56] the *parainesis* of the Athenian general is quoted directly by the Messenger of *Heracl.* (826-7), that of the Argive opponent indirectly (828-9); the Messenger of *IT* (1) quotes the words of his two pious fellow-herdsmen directly (267-8, 270-4), those of the impious one — though these are nearer the truth — only indirectly (276-8).

However, being quoted directly by a messenger is not always advantageous for a character. Thus Müller-Goldingen 188 argues that the Messenger's quotation of Eteocles' speech, in which the latter proposes the duel (*Ph.* 1225-35), underlines "das Frevlerische dieses Angebots". This would be one more instance of the general tendency in *Ph.* for Eteocles to be portrayed rather negatively.[57] The prominence given to words which are quoted directly may in some cases lead a messenger to decide not to quote them. Thus the Messenger of *Ion*, who wants to play down as much as possible the criminal role played by his mistress Creusa,[58] quotes only indirectly the confession of the Old Man, in which her guilt is brought out (1216).

I conclude that the technique of quoting people's words directly is used by the Euripidean messenger in an effective way, in order to make his narrative a dramatic one; the characters in his story come alive and speak for themselves, sometimes even in dialogue. We have seen that he does not quote everyone, nor does he restrict himself to important speeches; rather he selects those speeches which *he himself considers* important (because they are spoken by himself or his colleagues), indispensable (to an understanding of the development of the action),

[55] The cases of indirect speech are also collected in Appendix H.

[56] Cf. Erdmann 124. Willink ad 932-42 considers the whole speech an interpolation.

[57] I am less convinced by Müller-Goldingen's suggestion (218) that the fact that Polyneices is allowed to speak one last time (*Ph.* 1444-53), while his brother is not, is another instance of Euripides' favouring him above his brother. Eteocles' gestures (1437-41) are just as pathetic and 'eloquent' as Polyneices' words (see p. 143); the latter are, in fact, necessary, since they contain his request to be buried, thus sowing the seed for a new tragedy in the Labdacid-family.

[58] Cf. p. 15 on ὅ φασι ... (1185-6).

pathetic, or vital to his own 'message'. Finally, there are also the 'conventional' speeches. The messenger may also choose to represent a character's words only in indirect speech, thereby suggesting that they are less important, or playing down their impact.

Historic presents and direct speech give the messenger-speech an air of drama. However, it is a narrative, a verbal representation of action, instead of action performed on stage. How does this narrativity manifest itself?

3.3 The messenger-speech as narrative

Comparing narrative and drama has been a favourite pastime of literary critics, from Aristotle in his *Poetics* to Thomas Mann in his *Versuch über das Theater*.[59] Often they made no effort to hide their preference for one of the two text types. Thus Aristotle, for all his admiration for Homer, preferred drama, whereas Thomas Mann — naturally, one might think — preferred narrative.[60] The messenger-speech, which occurs as a narrative in drama, offers an interesting opportunity to once again undertake this comparison. In this section I will first examine a number of elements which enacted drama and messenger-speech have in common (scenery, objects, sounds, etc.), analyzing the differences in the way these elements are presented; I will then investigate an absolute difference between enacted drama and messenger-speech, viz. the absence/presence of a narrator. Instead of ending each subsection with a summary and conclusion I will save these for the final section, in which I draw up the balance between 'telling' and 'showing'.

[59] Cf. also Pfister 2-6, 201-11, 246-94; and Segre 3-26.

[60] On p. 17, for example: "Der Roman ist genauer, vollständiger, wissender, gewissenhafter, tiefer als das Drama, was die Erkenntnis der Menschen als Leib und Charakter betrifft und im Gegensatz zu der Anschauung, als sei das Drama das eigentlich plastische Dichtwerk, bekenne ich, daß ich es vielmehr als eine Kunst der Silhouette und den erzählten Menschen als rund, ganz, wirklich und plastisch empfinde."

(i) Gestures and miens

The gestures and miens of characters in a narrative have to be described by the narrator, since the hearer/reader cannot see them for himself. Thus the narrator of the *Iliad* has to describe how Thetis with her left hand embraced Zeus' knees and with her right hand took him under his chin (1.500-1) or how Hera smiled with her lips, while her dark eyebrows frowned (15.101-3). In this respect, however, Attic drama does not differ greatly from narrative, since the convention of wearing masks and the dimensions of the theatre made it necessary for all significant stage action to be incorporated in words as well: "People say what they are doing, or they are described doing it, or in one way or another the context makes it clear what is happening" (Taplin 1978: 17). Thus the conventional movements of supplication (falling on one's knees and clasping the other's knees) are described by the Messenger of *Or.*:

ταπεινοὶ
ἕζονθ', ὁ μὲν τὸ κεῖθεν, ὁ δὲ
τὸ κεῖθεν, ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν πεφραγμένοι.
περὶ δὲ γόνυ χέρας ἱκεσίους ἔβαλον ἔβαλον
Ἑλένας ἄμφω.

and [Orestes and Pylades] crouched all humble, one this side, one that, clutching from different angles. And flung, both flung their suppliant arms round Helen's knees.

(*Or.* 1411-5, transl. M. L. West)[61]

On stage these movements are enacted *and* verbalized (by Medea):

Μη. ἀλλ' ἄντομαί σε τῆσδε πρὸς γενειάδος
γονάτων τε τῶν σῶν ἱκεσία τε γίγνομαι

Me. but I entreat you here by your beard and knees and I supplicate you

(*Med.* 709-10)

Similarly, compare the Messenger's description of Aegisthus' facial expression in:

[61] Other examples of the description of a gesture in a messenger-speech: *Alc.* 189-91, 193-4; *Med.* 1206-7; *Heracl.* 844; *Hipp.* 1190; *El.* 788-9, 819-22; *HF* 964, 969, 986-7; *IT* 1381; *Ion* 1208-9; *Or.* 1444, 1466-8; *Ba.* 1117-8.

χὼ μὲν σκυθράζει

and he scowls

(*El.* 830)[62]

with Creon's words in:

Κρ. οἴμοι, τὸ μὲν σημεῖον εἰσορῶ τόδε,
<u>σκυθρωπὸν</u> <u>ὄμμα</u> καὶ <u>πρόσωπον</u> ἀγγέλου
στείχοντος

Cr. Alas, I see this sign — a <u>gloomy</u> <u>aspect</u> and <u>expression</u> of a messenger approaching

(*Ph.* 1332-4, transl. E. Craik)

The importance of gestures and miens in narratives may be illustrated by:

βλέψας δ' ἐπ' Ἄργος ἧκε Πολυνείκης ἀράς·
...
Ἐτεοκλέης δὲ Παλλάδος χρυσάσπιδος
βλέψας πρὸς οἶκον ηὔξατ'· ...

Polyneices, gazing in the direction of Argos, uttered a prayer: ...
Eteocles then, gazing at golden-shielded Pallas' house, prayed: ...

(*Ph.* 1364, 1372-3, transl. E. Craik)

The Messenger describes how Polyneices, about to pray to Hera, looks in the direction of Argos, whereas Eteocles, about to pray to Athena, looks in the direction of the Athena temple in Thebes. This may seem natural enough, but the fact that the brothers are reported as looking in different directions becomes significant when we recall their earlier onstage confrontation. Then, too, they refrained from looking at each other, as Jocasta's words make clear:

Io. σχάσον δὲ δεινὸν ὄμμα καὶ θυμοῦ πνοάς·
οὐ γὰρ τὸ λαιμότμητον εἰσορᾷς κάρα
Γοργόνος, ἀδελφὸν δ' εἰσορᾷς ἥκοντα σόν.

[62] Other examples of the description of a mien in a messenger-speech: *Alc.* 173-4; *Med.* 1162, 1168; *Or.* 893-4.

σύ τ' αὖ πρόσωπον πρὸς κασίγνητον στρέφε,
Πολύνεικες·

Jo. Stop your dreadful glare and gasps of anger. You are not looking at the throat-severed head of a Gorgon, but looking at your brother who has come. And you as well: turn your face to your brother, Polyneices.

(*Ph.* 454-8, transl. E. Craik)

At this stage Jocasta is still trying to make the two brothers look at each other, hoping that they will come to an agreement (458-9). Her efforts are in vain, however, and the information provided by the Messenger in 1364, 1372-3 about the direction of their gaze emphasizes once more their estrangement.

The question now rises of whether Euripides ever makes use of the narrativity of the messenger-speech to include longer, more complex or different descriptions of gestures and miens. I think that this is indeed sometimes the case. The first example is:

πρὶν μὲν τέκνων σῶν εἰσιδεῖν ξυνωρίδα,
πρόθυμον εἶχ' ὀφθαλμὸν εἰς Ἰάσονα·
ἔπειτα μέντοι προυκαλύψατ' ὄμματα
λευκήν τ' ἀπέστρεψ' ἔμπαλιν παρῆδα,
παίδων μυσαχθεῖσ' εἰσόδους.

before she [Creon's daughter] saw the pair of your children, she kept her eye fastened eagerly on Jason: then however she veiled her eyes and turned away her white cheek, upset at the entrance of the children.

(*Med.* 1145-9)

The Messenger here describes the succession of different expressions on the princess's face, which (to him) make it clear, without her speaking a word, both how much she adores Jason and how much she hates his children, who remind her of his past life with Medea.

The second example is:

λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος
ἔρρηξε λαγόνας ἐς μέσας παρ' ὀμφαλὸν
μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος
κάλλιστα, καὶ καθεῖσα πρὸς γαῖαν γόνυ
ἔλεξε

> taking her dress she [Polyxena] ripped it from her shoulder to her flanks beside the navel and showed her breasts and bosom, as beautiful as a statue's, and falling to the ground on her knees she spoke
>
> (*Hec.* 558-62)

Here the Messenger is able to describe Polyxena doing what Clytemnestra in A. *Ch.* 896-8 could only symbolically perform onstage,[63] viz. bare her breasts. Polyxena's gesture is fraught with meaning: it underlines her readiness to die and her eagerness to die heroically: after she had (in 549) offered her neck — the customary place to strike a sacrificial victim, cf. ἀποδηροτομεῖν, λαιμοτομεῖν — she now even invites Neoptolemus to strike her breast (563-5).[64]

My third and last example is:

> στέρνων δ' ἄπο
> φύσημ' ἀνεὶς δύσθνητον Ἐτεοκλῆς ἄναξ
> ἤκουσε μητρός, κἀπιθεὶς ὑγρὰν χέρα
> φωνὴν μὲν οὐκ ἀφῆκεν, ὀμμάτων δ' ἄπο
> προσεῖπε δακρύοις, ὥστε σημῆναι φίλα.

> From his breast heaving a gasp in death throes, King Eteocles heard his mother and, laying on her a clammy hand, uttered no speech; but from his eyes spoke with tears, so as to give a sign of love.
>
> (*Ph.* 1437-41, transl. E. Craik)

As in the passage from *Med.* we hear of gestures and gazes which replace words; here the substitution is indicated explicitly (1440-1). A detail like ὑγρὰν χέρα could not be expressed easily in an enacted scene.

The effect of a gesture or mien in a messenger-speech is enhanced when the motivation for, or the emotion behind that gesture or mien is also supplied (by the messenger). This is the case in:

[63] See Taplin 1978: 61.

[64] I disagree with Michelini 163 that there is "an evident contradiction between Polyxena's refusal to be touched [548-9] and her provocative preparations for the sacrifice" [558-61]. Both are a manifestation of the girl's determination to die freely and heroically.

ὃ δὲ μίτραν κόμης ἄπο
ἔρριψεν, ὥς νιν γνωρίσασα μὴ κτάνοι
τλήμων Ἀγαύη

he [Pentheus] hurled away the snood from his hair, for the wretched Agave to recognize and not kill him

(*Ba.* 1115-7, transl. G.S. Kirk)[65]

Just as Pentheus had earlier put on his female, maenadic disguise in order *not* to be recognized (cf. 823: μή σε κτάνωσιν, ἢν ἀνὴρ ὀφθῇς ἐκεῖ), he now throws it off — the snood here functions as a *pars pro toto* for Pentheus' whole maenadic disguise — precisely in order to be recognized.

(ii) Tone, sound and silence

"Most novels contain a lot of dialogue, but the accompaniments of tone, gesture, etc. have to be added in narrative form".[66] The speeches quoted by the messenger are most often introduced[67] by a simple and neutral verb of speaking (ἔλεγε, εἶπε, ἠγόρευε, αὐδᾷ, etc.), though occasionally more specific verbs are used: lamenting (e.g. *Med.* 1206, *Ph.* 1432), shouting (e.g. *Andr.* 1124, *Hel.* 1592), asking a question (e.g. *El.* 830, *Hel.* 1578), praying (*IT* 269, 1398), exhorting (e.g. *Supp.* 700-1, *Hel.* 1602). I will discuss two speech-introductions where a special effect seems to be intended:

ἔρρηξε δ' αὐδὴν ὥσθ' ὑπηχῆσαι χθόνα

and the whole earth re-echoed with his [Theseus'] bursting roar

(*Supp.* 710, transl. P. Vellacott)

[65] Other examples: *Alc.* 190-1 (λαμβάνουσ' ἐς ἀγκάλας ἠσπάζετ' ... ὡς θανουμένη) and *HF* 967-9 (νιν Εὐρυσθέως δοκῶν πατέρα προταρβοῦνθ' ἱκέσιον ψαύειν χερὸς ὠθεῖ).

[66] Taplin 1978: 3. In narratology these "accompaniments" are known as attributive discourse: see De Jong 1987a: 195-208, and see Führer 1-105 for "die Umrahmung der Rede" in archaic lyric poetry.

[67] Whereas in Homer speeches are invariably introduced and capped, the Euripidean messenger nearly always — for the two exceptions, see p. 132-3 — introduces embedded speeches, but does not cap them.

This is a much stronger version of the regular 'he shouted/adhorted'. In the epic parallels for the ὑπηχῆσαι χθόνα motif (*Il.* 2. 465, Hes. *Th.* 835,[68] and cf. ἠχῇ θεσπεσίῃ, e.g. in *Il.* 8.159, 15.590) it is the feet or cries of many men which make the earth resound; and only gods can shout as loud as nine or ten thousand mortals (*Il.* 5.859-61). Thus the Messenger, who is an ardent admirer of Theseus, through his use of this motif in connection with one individual is presenting him as an almost superhuman commander.

ὁ δ' ἠλάλαξε κἀπεκόμπασεν τάδε

And he [Heracles] shouted victory and spoke the following boasting words (*HF* 981)

The speech-introduction, containing two very specific verbs of speaking, strengthens the horror of Heracles' following words, in which he glories in his victory over ... one of his own sons.

Apart from the sound of human or divine voices,[69] the messenger does not record much 'noise'; his descriptions are visual rather than auditive. Occasionally we have a bull bellowing (*Hel.* 1557), cattle lowing (*Ba.* 691), herdsmen blowing on shells (*IT* 303), a house resounding with people running around (*Med.* 1180, *El.* 802), the sound of trumpets (*Ph.* 1102-3, 1377-8), or the roaring of the earth (*Ph.* 1181-2). Of the more sustained and significant 'sound-effects', we have already (p. 83) come across the echo of shouting against the rocks of Delphi (*Andr.* 1144-5). I will discuss two more examples.

Shouting and noise are stock elements of battle and we find a description of the din of war in:

ἐπεὶ δ' ἐσήμην' ὄρθιον Τυρσηνικῇ
σάλπιγγι καὶ συνῆψαν ἀλλήλοις μάχην,

[68] Collard 1975: 292, ad 710-2

[69] Cf. in addition to the speech-introductions: *Alc.* 195 (προσεῖπε καὶ προσερρήθη); *Med.* 1157 (ᾔνεσ'), 1173 (ἀνωλόλυξε), 1176-7 (ἧκεν ... κωκυτόν); *Supp.* 721 (βοὴ δὲ καὶ κωκυτός); *HF* 976 (βοᾷ); *IT* 1337-8 (ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ κατῇδε βάρβαρα μέλη); *Ion* 1189 (βλασφημίαν ... ἐφθέγξατο); *Hel.* 1528 (ἀνέστενε); *Ph.* 1237 (ἐπῄνει λόγους); *Ba.* 1057 (βακχεῖον ἀντέκλαζον ... μέλος), 1088 (ἐπεκέλευσεν), 1132-3 (στενάζων ... ἠλάλαζον).

πόσον τιν' αὐχεῖς πάταγον ἀσπίδων βρέμειν,
πόσον τινὰ στεναγμὸν οἰμωγήν θ' ὁμοῦ;

After he had given a clear signal with the Tyrrhenian trumpet and the ranks had closed in for battle, how much din do you imagine arose as shield met shield, how many screams mingled with groans?

(*Heracl.* 830-3)

We can compare this passage to *Supp.* 686-93, where a messenger gives a *visual* description of a raging battle. As we have seen (pp. 72-3), that Messenger used a first-person verb-form + interrogatory mode (τί πρῶτον εἴπω;) to increase the impact of his description; this Messenger turns to his addressee and uses a second-person verb-form + interrogatory mode (τίν' ... αὐχεῖς;) to achieve emphasis and engagement.

My second example concerns the messenger-speech in *Hipp.*, in which we find a mixture of visual and auditive description. In 1201-2 the Messenger, and the other persons and animals present, hear a frightening noise, a deep rumbling of the earth (auditive description). Note in particular the effect of the repeated β in βροντὴ ... βαρὺν βρόμον. The noise disquiets both horses and men (1203-5). Then they see an enormous wave, which obscures Sciron's rock, the Isthmus and Asclepius' rock (visual description: 1205-9). The wave puts ashore a bull, a wild monster (visual description: 1210-4). The bull makes a terrible noise (auditive description: 1215-6), after which one might expect a more detailed visual description of its appearance: "Après avoir décrit avec tant de détail le départ d'Hippolyte, le lieu de la scène, tout ce qui précède et annonce l'apparition du monstre, Euripide s'abstient de faire la description de ce monstre lui-même" (Weil *ad loc.*). The reason for the lack of a visual description is explicitly stated; the Messenger is too frightened to look:

εἰσορῶσι δὲ
κρεῖσσον θέαμα δεργμάτων ἐφαίνετο.

for us watching, the sight was more than our eyes could bear.

(*Hipp.* 1216-7)

Thus, while he could not close his ears to the terrifying noise produced by the bull, he can refrain from looking at it too closely.[70] But of course he cannot continue closing his eyes and a predominantly visual description describes the bull's attack on Hippolytus and the latter's destruction (1219-48). The bull now proceeds in silence (σιγῇ: 1231) and the only sound heard is Hippolytus' moving plea for help (1240-2), which the Messenger effectively introduces not only with a verb of speaking but also with one of hearing: δεινὰ δ' ἐξαυδῶν κλύειν (1239).[71]

The most spectacular sound effects found in messenger-speeches are ... the silences. In the first place, certain characters remain silent at significant moments: the Delphians in *Andr.* 1127-8, who do not reply when Neoptolemus asks why they are killing him; and Creon in *Supp.* 673-4, who does not respond to Theseus' proposal for a peaceful settlement. Note that these two silences are quite different in their significance: the silence of the Delphians shows once more (cf. 1109-11) their indoctrination by Orestes; they pay no heed to Neoptolemus' plea of innocence, but continue their attack (ἀλλ' ἔβαλλον ἐκ χειρῶν πέτροις); Creon's silence may be interpreted as "a sign of defiance" (Collard 1975: ad 673-4).

In the second place, there are the pregnant silences before the storm in *Andr.* 1145-6 (Neoptolemus stands for a short while in 'fair weather' before the voice from within signals the final and mortal attack on him), *HF* 930 (a moment of silence precedes the onset of Heracles' madness), *Ion* 1194 (a moment of silence precedes the arrival of the birds which will save Ion's life), and

σίγησε δ' αἰθήρ, σῖγα δ' ὕλιμος νάπη
φύλλ' εἶχε, θηρῶν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἤκουσας βοήν.

the high air went silent, and the woody glade held its leaves in stillness, and you could not have heard the cry of any beast.

(*Ba.* 1084-5, transl. E.R. Dodds)

[70] Barlow 1971: 71-3 compares Euripides' restraint — which, according to her, he adopts, because to describe the bull at length "would slow down the action, or appear to distort fact" — with Seneca's exuberance in his *Phaedra* 1035ff.

[71] Cf. *IT* 320 (τὸ δεινὸν παρακέλευσμ' ἠκούσαμεν).

This last silence is significant in many different ways: it is the silence before the storm, for the Maenads are about to attack Pentheus (Winnington-Ingram 1949: 129), the silence before a supernatural intervention (Dodds, Stanford 1983: 62),[72] and the silence before a sacrifice (Roux, Seidensticker 184-5).[73] It will be clear that the silence of nature would have been very difficult to imitate on stage. It can, however, be evoked most effectively by the Messenger, who puts a "quiet note of menace" (Stanford) into his voice.

(iii) Scenery

In narrative there are in theory no limitations to the scene setting and changes of scene; in the Homeric epics, for example, the settings range from the depths of the ocean to the heights of Mt. Olympus, and a change of scene can be accomplished within one verse, e.g. *Il.* 22. 166. By contrast, the scenery in Attic drama was severely limited by two factors: (1) the 'unity of place' occasioned by the constant physical presence of the chorus, which though not yet an absolute rule was adhered to in most plays;[74] and (2) the soberness of the decor: the same skene building had to form the background to different plays and it was therefore provided with only few distinctive features; thus the *scaena tragica* represented the façade of an impressive building (temple or palace), with a central door, and a number columns. With the help of painted panels, slight adjustments could be made. Next to the skene building there might be such movable properties as altars or statues.[75] In accordance with its soberness and neutrality, characters generally refer

[72] Stanford mentions as parallels *Od.* 12.168-9 (winds and waves become quiet at the moment Odysseus comes near the Sirens; this silence is of course a logical element of the story, since it allows Odysseus to hear the Sirens' song better), and A. *A.* 737-40 (Helen's arrival in Troy is compared to the 'temper of a windless calm' before disaster sets in); Burnett 1971: 117 mentions S. *OC* 1623 (the Messenger reports a moment of silence before the god addresses Oedipus).

[73] The significance of a silence before a supernatural intervention can also be attributed to *Andr.* 1145-6, *HF* 930, and *Ion* 1194; that of a silence before a sacrifice to *HF* 930 and *Ion* 1194.

[74] See further Bremer 1976: 30-4 and Taplin 1977: 103-5. Change of scene occurs in A. *Eum.* and S. *Aj.*, whereas in A. *Pers.* and *Ch.* we have fluidity of scene.

[75] See Hourmouziades 1-57.

to the visual background in unspecific terms: 'the house', 'the building', or even simply 'inside'.[76] According to Hourmouziades, the description of the 'unseen' scenery — which he divides into "interior" (83-92) and "offstage" (109-27) — is almost as unspecific as the 'seen' scenery:

> True, he [Euripides] appears a bit more eloquent in acquainting his audience with the imaginary part of his setting, but even here the various details are introduced in a casual way, as if the spectators were supposed to know as much about them as the characters in the play, who make their allusions without ever displaying the slightest intention of imparting useful information.[77]

Despite their casual introduction, details of setting — both seen and unseen — are hardly ever without significance or effect;[78] it may be worthwhile to take a closer look at the unseen scenery of the messenger-speech, especially as scholarship on the Euripidean messenger-speech has neglected this aspect.[79]

I will begin with a number of general remarks, before turning to the individual plays. The first thing to note is, of course, that there are no limitations to the possibilities for scene setting and scene changes here — this is one of the *raisons d'être* of the messenger-speech:[80] shores, seas, mountains, but also the interiors of houses, tents and temples form the background to the messenger's stories. The characters may travel over considerable distances (e.g. Iolaus in the messenger-speech in *Heracl.* pursues Eurystheus from Marathon to the Scironian rocks), while scenes may change (e.g. in *Ba.* (1) we move from Mt. Cithaeron to the villages at the foot of the mountain and back again). The degree of scene description varies from virtually nothing (*Heracl.*) to a wealth of detail (*Ion*), but all the messengers except the one in *Heracl.* at least begin

[76] Hourmouziades 13.

[77] Hourmouziades 113, and cf. 84.

[78] Cf. Taplin 1977: 103 ("In a few plays the precise setting is of very little significance (e.g. E. *Hik.*, *Hkld.*); but in others the exact setting and even the details of its topography are of great importance (e.g. S. *Phil.*, *OC*, E. *Rh.*)") and Barlow 1971: 73 ("Taking Euripides' narrative speeches as a whole, there are ... few details of scenic description which are not germane in some way to the event itself").

[79] See Bassi 87-8, Fischl 29, Henning 40, Erdmann 181, who only remark that the scenery is indicated briefly at the beginning of each story.

[80] Cf. Hourmouziades 110: "The possibilities of the off-stage area were unlimited."

their story with an indication of the place where the events will take place:[81] ἐν δόμοις (*Alc.* 157), νυμφικοὺς δόμους (*Med.* 1137), ἀκτῆς κυμοδέγμονος πέλας (*Hipp.* 1173), τὸ κλεινὸν ... Φοίβου πέδον (*Andr.* 1085), etc.

I turn now to the individual plays. In the messenger-speech in *Alc.* the Messenger, a female retainer of Alcestis, reports what her mistress has been doing 'inside the house' (ἐν δόμοις: 157): she started by carrying out herself the preliminary rites of her funeral (washing and dressing). The κεδρίνων δόμων (160) from which she fetches her clothes is — I think, rightly — associated by Dale with *Il.* 24.191-2, where Priam fetches the robes of Hector's ransom from a θάλαμον ... κέδρινον. This is one more indication of the care with which Alcestis prepares herself for death (cf. εὐπρεπῶς: 162).[82] Then she prayed to all the hearths in 'Admetus' house' ('Αδμήτου δόμους: 170). Since we have been in Admetus' house all the time, the addition of 'Αδμήτου here seems to be not without significance. It symbolizes Alcestis' position as a woman, and more particularly, as a wife, which, as she will set out in 177-82, leaves her no choice but to die for her husband. So far, the Messenger tells us, Alcestis was composed, but upon entering her bedroom (θάλαμον: 175) and seeing her marital bed (note the repetition: λέχος: 175, λέκτρον: 177, δέμνιον: 183, δεμνίων: 186, κοίτην: 188) she broke down. It is only now, addressing her bed, that, for once, she shows her innermost feelings about the sacrifice: she knows that she is σώφρων, but would have liked to be more εὐτυχής (182). The privacy of her bedroom and the almost complete absence of other people account for the fact that she feels able to bare her soul here. The bed receives all the tears and kisses which Admetus later does not receive onstage. Onstage she has regained the composure which the Messenger had reported in 158-74. The difference between her offstage breakdown and her onstage composure may account for the apparent discrepancy[83] between 181 (Alcestis prophesies that another woman will occupy her bed) and 299-310 (she requests Admetus not to marry another woman):

[81] Cf. Barlow 1971: 62: "Like most good storytellers, Euripides begins these messenger speeches with a brief indication of time and place", and note 79.

[82] Note also that Hector's body will be dressed in one of the robes Priam had taken with him: 580-1, 588.

[83] Grube 135, Erbse 41-2, Lesky 286.

"at the height of her despair Alkestis apparently takes for granted what later on she will endeavour to avert at any cost".[84]

In the messenger-speech in *Med.* the epithet νυμφικούς in the scene-setting of 1137 (παρῆλθε νυμφικοὺς δόμους) deserves our attention. It reminds us once more of the status of Creon's daughter as 'just married' (cf. 288, 957 and in the messenger-speech itself τὸν ἀρτίως πόσιν ... νύμφης: 1178-9). In 378 Medea had already considered setting fire to the δῶμα νυμφικόν. Here νυμφικός gives expression to her anger and hurt (cf. also ἵν' ἔστρωται λέχος: 380), but coming from the Messenger, who pities the young bride, it serves to increase the pathos of the events to come.

The scenery of the messenger-speech in *Heracl.* is highly unspecific. Only the report (based on hearsay) of Iolaus' pursuit of Eurystheus contains two concrete geographical indications: Παλληνίδος ... σεμνὸν ... πάγον δίας 'Αθάνας (849-50) and πέτραις Σκιρωνίσιν (860). Similar geographical indications are found in: *Hipp.* 1197 (τὴν εὐθὺς Ἄργους κἀπιδαυρίας ὁδόν), 1200 (πόντον ... Σαρωνικόν), 1208-9 (Σκίρωνος ἀκτὰς ... Ἰσθμὸν ... πέτραν 'Ασκληπιοῦ); *Supp.* 655 ('Ισμήνιον ... ὄχθον), 660 (κρήνην ... Ἄρεος), 663 (σεμνῶν μνημάτων 'Αμφίονος); *IT* 260-1 (τὸν ἐκρέοντα διὰ Συμπληγάδων ... πόντον); *Ph.* 1100 (Τευμησόν), 1104 (Νηΐταις πύλαις), etc.; *Ba.* 749 ('Ασωποῦ ῥοαῖς), 751 ('Υσιάς, 'Ερυθράς, Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας), 1044 ('Ασωποῦ ῥοάς), 1045 (λέπας Κιθαιρώνειον). According to Hourmouziades 110, "to demand 'geographical realism' in cases like these is futile":

> It is highly improbable that the poet composed his plays with a map of the world before him. Nor did any of his audience, while listening, for instance to the messenger's account of Hippolytus' accident, think of checking the accuracy of the route followed by the banished hero with reference to the actual topography of the district around Troezen.

Other scholars are less sceptical: "In the present passage his descriptions seem again to be basically correct" (Barrett ad *Hipp.* 1198-1200); "Disposition of the armies, apparently relying on the actual topography of Thebes; E. is frequently realistic with this kind of detail, but precise

[84] Van Lennep 181-2. I disagree with Erbse 41 that Alcestis in 181 is speaking in "naiver Unbefangenheit".

correlation here with the findings of archaeology is difficult and perhaps illusory" (Collard ad *Supp.* 653-7). The question of whether Euripides gives correct, incorrect or even imaginary geographical information is less important on the level of the internal communication, that of the messenger and his internal addressee(s). To them the geographical details are 'real' and they serve to increase the verisimilitude of the messenger's story,[85] to give it the appearance of a detailed and accurate report. Thus they are one more manifestation of the messenger's tendency to authenticate his story (see p. 11).

As regards the scenery of the messenger-speech in *Hipp.*, two points are relevant in addition to the geographical details. The fact that Hippolytus meets with disaster at the seashore — the place where he used to race his horses: cf. 228-31, 234-5, 1126, 1131-4 — contributes to the pathetic tendency noted earlier (p. 84), viz. of Hippolytus being defeated with his own weapons, and, as it now appears, on his own ground. The fact that the seashore is a deserted piece of land (ἔρημον χῶρον: 1198) also seems to be significant: as we know from his 'hymn' to Artemis (73-87) he is a lover of solitude and in his extreme puritanism he is somewhat 'removed' from normal society.[86]

In the case of the messenger-speech in *Andr.* "scholars have disagreed on the relation of some parts of the narrative to what is known or conjectured about the topography of the sacred precinct", and I refer the reader to Stevens ad 1100-1157 and Winnington-Ingram 1976: 487-90 for a summary of this discussion. I have already pointed out (p. 84) how the Messenger through the choice of his epithets (in 1085, 1138, 1144, and 1157) makes clear his indignation at seeing the 'famous' and 'holy' place of Delphi abused for purposes of a base murder. One more detail of the scenery contributes to this implicit commentary:

> τῷ δὲ ξιφήρης ἆρ' ὑφειστήκει λόχος
> δάφνῃ σκιασθείς

[85] Cf. Collard 1975: 278, ad *Supp.* 650-730. Note also how the Messenger of *Supp.* takes care in 655 (ὡς μὲν ἦν λόγος) to explain how he, who is after all a stranger to Thebes, knows the name of the Ismenian hill.

[86] Cf. Barrett ad 79-81: "in these lines ... there appears the first hint (to be developed in the following dialogue) of a remoteness and intolerance that make that life inadequate".

> but against him an armed squadron lay in ambush covered by the laurel
> (*Andr.* 1114-5)

Not even the laurel, Apollo's sacred tree, is left in peace.

The messenger-speech in *Hec.* contains only two indications of scenery, which are however sufficient: the mass of soldiers, Talthybius tells us, gathered 'in front of the [Achilles'] tomb' (522: πρὸ τύμβου); Neoptolemus, Talthybius, the victim Polyxena and a few young soldiers stand on top of it (524: ἐπ' ἄκρου χώματος). From the beginning of the play it was clear that the sacrifice would take place near Achilles' tomb, since Achilles is its recipient.[87] Situating it on top of the tomb means that Polyxena's actions are clearly visible to all; she is provided with a 'platform' for her heroic performance.

Two points connected with the scenery in the messenger-speech in *El.* merit attention. In the first place, there are the idyllic surroundings in which Aegisthus finds himself at the moment of Orestes' arrival:

> κυρεῖ δὲ κήποις ἐν καταρρύτοις βεβώς,
> δρέπων τερείνης μυρσίνης κάρᾳ πλόκους·

> we found him walking in a watered orchard, cutting sprays of tender myrtle for his hair.
> (*El.* 777-8, transl. M.J. Cropp)

In 623 the Old Man had told Orestes that Aegisthus was at his horse-breeding grounds (ἱπποφορβίων ἔπι), but now we are given a more detailed description of this *locus amoenus.*[88] What is the significance of this? Here we must, I think, recall once more the distinction between internal and external communication. For when Barlow 1971: 74 writes that "this fleeting piece of imagery establishes a new context for the traditional crime, not just to arouse pathos, but also to enable the audience to understand intellectually the particularly obsessive nature of Orestes' act of murder", this is true only of Euripides and the specta-

[87] Cf. 41, 119, 150 (τύμβῳ), 126 (τύμβον), 189 (πρὸς τύμβον), 221 (πρὸς ὀρθὸν χῶμ').

[88] Note, in addition to the combined presence of water and trees, the — for Euripides — unique combination τερείνης μυρσίνης.

tors.[89] The Messenger, himself a servant of Orestes and addressing Electra, is in no way intent upon arousing pathos or showing the obsessive nature of Orestes' act of murder; on the contrary, he considers the murder a victory. He seems to describe the idyllic setting and Aegisthus' peaceful doings there, because he savours the irony of Aegisthus' situation, which he knows will soon change for the worse.[90] This ironic interpretation, on the level of the internal communication, is confirmed by two small details: (1) μυρσίνης: the myrtle was not only used at banquets and sacrifices, but was also associated with death (cf. 324);[91] (2) κάρᾳ πλόκους: the one whose head will in the end be crowned is Orestes (854, 872). The second aspect of the setting which I would like to discuss is the fact that from 787 onwards (ἀλλ' ἴωμεν ἐς δόμους) the scene is set *inside* Aegisthus' country house, where it will remain until the end of the story (cf. 790: ἐν οἴκοις, 802: στέγῃ). Why? Both Aeschylus and Sophocles had to locate the murder of Aegisthus inside the palace of Mycenae in order to remove it from the gaze of the spectators. From the beginning, however, Euripides located the plot against Aegisthus offstage, and was therefore not compelled to have the murder take place inside a house. The only reason I can think of is that this accentuates the irony of Aegisthus' words in 831-2 (ὀρρωδῶ τινα δόλον θυραῖον): Aegisthus fears an attack by Orestes from outside, but he is in fact murdered by him inside, not in his palace in Mycenae, but in his own country-house.[92]

The scenery of the messenger-speech in *HF* is of a very special kind. In effect, we are dealing with a double scene: the real one (interior of Heracles' palace) and the imaginary one projected by Heracles in his delusion (from Thebes he travels via 'Megara' and the 'Isthmus' to 'Mycenae'). This messenger-speech will be analyzed in detail below (pp.

[89] The same applies to Arnott's analysis (1981: 186-7): "First, by prefacing his [the Messenger's] story of the murder with a full description of Aegistheus' courteous generosity to Orestes during the preliminary stages of a sacrifice held in the idyllic surroundings of a park, he increases the shock effect of the murder itself".

[90] See for other instances of irony in this story above pp. 132-4.

[91] Cf. Cropp *ad loc.*: "Its association with death gives a dramatic irony here."

[92] Denniston has misunderstood θυραῖον: "'Treachery from abroad'. But in a sense it is οἰκεῖος, it comes from his own cousin." It is clear from what follows in 832-3 that when Aegisthus uses θυραῖον he is already thinking of Orestes.

165-71). For the moment, note the initial setting: Heracles and his family are standing around an altar of Zeus (922-7). This resembles the beginning of the play, when Heracles' family, minus Heracles, also find themselves near an altar of Zeus. The two altars are not the same, since the one — erected by Heracles to commemorate his victory over the Minyans: 48-50 — is onstage, and the other — presumably the altar of Zeus ἑρκεῖος — is offstage. However, the fact that both altars are dedicated to Zeus establishes a link; the setting in this messenger-speech becomes one more means by which Heracles' reversal of roles (from saviour to destroyer) is made graphically clear, especially since he kills his second son in the vicinity of the altar (984ff.).

In the two messenger-speeches of *IT* the scenery is the same, viz. the rocky shore of the Pontus Euxinus.[93] In *IT* (1) the events centre on a cave, 'split asunder and hollowed out by much tossing of waves' (262-3), in which Orestes and Pylades had hidden themselves, as suggested by Pylades in 106-7 (κρύψωμεν δέμας κατ' ἄντρ' ἃ πόντος νοτίδι διακλύζει μέλας νεὼς ἄπωθεν). The Messenger, being a local, contributes the — in itself — irrelevant information that in this cave purple-fishers usually stay (πορφυρευτικαὶ στέγαι: 263). Although not explicitly stated, it seems that the herdsmen spot the strangers from above, while standing on the cliffs. They do not come down until 301ff. to attack Orestes who is in turn attacking their cattle, which are in the sea (260-1). In 324 they climb up the cliffs again (φυγῇ λεπαίας ἐξεπίμπλαμεν νάπας), and from there they bombard the strangers with stones until they have overpowered them. In *IT* (2) we find ourselves on the same beach; now, however, we are in the vicinity of Orestes' ship, which has been secretly moored, and thus at some distance from the cave (cf. 107). Once more we hear about Taurians fleeing towards the cliffs (1373: ἐφεύγομεν πρὸς κρημνόν), and from this strategic position pelting Orestes and his companions with stones (1375-6).

The description of the scenery of the messenger-speech in *Ion* is exceptional for its detail: in an *ecphrasis* of 33 verses (1132-65) the Messenger describes how Ion erected the festive tent in which the

[93] Hourmouziades 124-5 speaks of the "technique of preparing in a preliminary, as it were, narrative an imaginary 'scenery', which will serve later on as a background to an important off-stage event". This technique is used to even greater effect in *Ba.* (1) and (2).

banquet was held. Ion covers the tent with tapestries which were given to the Delphian treasuries as votives. Much has been written about the significance of the scenes woven into these tapestries. The arguments are too complex to be summarized here, and I refer the reader to (in chronological order) Burnett 1962: 96, Wolff, Müller, Mastronarde and Goff. On the level of the internal communication (between the Messenger and his addressees, the chorus), the *ecphrasis* is motivated by the former's admiration for the wonderful tapestries: θαύματ' ἀνθρώποις ὁρᾶν (1142). Similarly, the chorus had in the first stasimon admired the pediments of the Apollo-temple (184-218).

In *Hel.* (1) the setting is a cave: σεμνὸν ἄντρον (607). The epithet σεμνόν is interesting here. In 424-7 Menelaus said that he had concealed Helen ἐν ἄντρου μύχοις and left his comrades to watch over her. The Messenger now refers to this same cave as 'hallowed'. According to Dale, "the epithet seems idle because unexplained, unless the cave is meant to be self-evidently 'hallowed' by having sheltered the disappearing Phantom, or as being, like many caves, sacred to the Nymphs." Her second suggestion ("'hallowed' by having sheltered the disappearing Phantom") cannot be correct, since at this stage the Messenger does not know of the existence of the Phantom; he still thinks that the person who has disappeared is Helen (cf. 605: ἄλοχος σή and 619ff.). Kannicht provides what is, in my opinion, the correct interpretation: "das ἄντρον ist in den Augen des Therapon durch das numinose Geschehen das er in ihm erlebt hat, σεμνόν geworden." The Messenger had, after all, seen 'Helen' fly towards heaven.

The setting of *Hel.* (2) is a rather nondescript shore (1539: προσῆλθον ἀκταῖς) and sea (1527: πρὸς θάλασσαν).

The most striking aspect of the setting in *Ph.* (1) is that Polyneices does *not* occupy the seventh gate (as he did in A. *Th.* 631-48) and that Eteocles does *not* position himself there opposite his brother (as he did in A. *Th.* 672-6). As far as this first messenger-speech is concerned, the brothers do not confront each other at all: Polyneices is at first stationed at the Crenean gate (1123-4) — it is Adrastus who occupies the seventh gate (1134)[94] — but soon he hurries from one gate to another to

[94] Adrastus' gate is the only one which is not referred to by name (Νηΐταις πύλαις: 1104, etc.), but by means of a number (ταῖς ... ἑβδόμαις ... ἐν πύλαισιν:

succour his men (1164: ἄλλας [sc. πύλας] ἐπῄει, 1170: ἐς δ' ἄλλας πύλας ἠπειγόμεσθα). It is not until the attack of the Seven has been successfully repulsed by the Thebans, and the latter have come out to fight a chariot-battle (1189-95), that Eteocles proposes to his brother — we are now in *Ph.* (2) — that a duel should decide the matter between them (1225-35). Eteocles' and Polyneices' 'free' position symbolizes their free decision to confront each other; this is one more indication that Oedipus' curse is fulfilled not so much by fate, as by human motivation.[95]

In *Or.* (1) the scene is set on the hill

> οὗ φασι πρῶτον Δαναὸν Αἰγύπτῳ δίκας
> διδόντ' ἀθροῖσαι λαὸν ἐς κοινὰς ἕδρας.

> where they say Danaus, submitting himself to judgement against Aegyptus, first assembled the people to sit together.
>
> (*Or.* 872-3, transl. M.L. West)

This mythological rather than topographical location seems to be motivated by two factors: (1) Euripides often refers to the Argives as Δαναΐδαι (note immediately afterwards 876 and see Collard ad *Supp.* 130), and (2) Danaus, like Orestes and Electra, had to stand trial for murder.

Or. (2) is situated inside the palace of the Atrides. From the very beginning of the play we know that Helen finds herself inside this palace (60-1, 744, 1107-8),[96] which she leaves only in 71-125 for a short onstage appearance. At the moment that Orestes and Pylades enter, she is sitting on a throne and is being fanned by her Phrygian slaves. This

1134), obviously in order to stress the surprising fact that the seventh gate is not occupied by the two brothers. For Euripides' technique of playing on his spectators' expectations, see Said 1985.

[95] Conacher 1967: 239-40: "Thus the essential difference between the two presentations is that, while the generalship of Aeschylus' Eteocles ... involves him, with what looks like predetermined "accident," in the slaughter of his brother, both brothers, in Euripides' play, clearly chose to kill each other in the pursuit of their personal rights and ambitions."

[96] On the one hand she hides herself there (1107), fearful of being lynched by angry Argives (cf. 56-60, 102); on the other hand she conducts herself as mistress of the house (1108), to Orestes' obvious annoyance (744).

setting characterizes her as having the airs of an oriental queen.[97] Orestes entices her away from her seat towards what he refers to as 'Pelops', my forefather's ancient hearth-seat' (1441-2): "the central hearth of the Palace is (overtly) a suitable place for a solemn supplication ...; also (grimly) for the intended 'sacrifice'" (Willink ad 1437-42). I would also recall Menelaus addressing the house in 356-9, where he says that he has never seen 'a hearth more circled about with grievous ills'. The hearth in 1441-2 symbolizes the Pelops family and the tragic succession of murders (the next about to be committed by Orestes). As announced in 1127, Pylades shuts up the Phrygians ἄλλον ἄλλοσ' ἐν στέγαισι (1448), i.e. in the stables or outlying apartments — here we see the flexibility of the unseen scenery, which can be stretched to provide all sorts of rooms —, just as in 1475 the Phrygians will come to Helen's aid ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν στέγης. Both Helen and the Messenger leave the unseen scene in unconventional fashion (the Phrygian over the roof: 1369-72, Helen in some mysterious way: 1493-6).

The scenery of *Ba.* (1) and (2) is identical, as is that of *IT* (1) and (2), and *Ph.* (1), (2), and (3), (4): the grassy glens of Mt. Cithaeron. The fact that the Theban Maenads find themselves on this mountain has been indicated on several occasions (33, 38, 62, 218-9)[98] even before the arrival of the first Messenger; that they should be located on a mountain was predetermined by the Bacchic ritual of the ὀρειβασία (Dodds xiii-xiv), which is illustrated in the Parodos (cf. ἐν ὄρεσσι: 76, εἰς ὄρος εἰς ὄρος: 116, 165, ἐν ὄρεσιν: 135). When the Messenger-herdsman of *Ba.* (1) spots the Theban Maenads they are asleep, some with their backs against branches of pine trees, others on a bed of oak leaves (684-5). While pine and oak are natural to this kind of environment, they also have a ritual meaning (cf. 109-10: καταβακχιοῦσθε δρυὸς ἢ ἐλάτας κλάδοισι and Dodds *ad loc.*; and 703, where we hear about wreaths made of oak leaves). The trees will also play a sinister role in the events themselves: in *Ba.* (2) climbing a pine tree will prove fatal to Pentheus,

[97] This had already been remarked by Pylades and Orestes in 1113-4. Cf. also the description of the orientalized Clytemnestra in *El.* 314-8.

[98] Note the contrast between Dionysus' ἀνορόφοις ... πέτραις ('roofless rocks': 38), which has the implication that the Maenads have nothing to hide, and Pentheus' ἐν ... δασκίοις ὄρεσι ('shadowed mountains': 218-9), which aligns with his conviction that the Maenads do secret and forbidden things.

while the Maenads will use these same branches of oak and pine as weapons and instruments in their attack on him. In 748ff. the Maenads temporarily leave Mt. Cithaeron for the plains near the river Asopus and the villages Hysiae and Erythrae, which lie at the foot of the mountain. These three stations (mountain, river, villages) return, in reverse order, at the beginning of *Ba.* (2), where the Messenger reports how they left the villages, went beyond the Asopus and started to climb the λέπας Κιθαιρώνειον (1043-5). Mention of this route cannot but increase the suspense of the spectators.[99] In this second messenger-speech the place where the Theban Maenads find themselves is described in more detail, and is introduced by an epic expositional formula ('there is a place ...'):[100]

> ἦν δ' ἄγκος ἀμφίκρημνον, ὕδασι διάβροχον,
> πεύκαισι συσκιάζον, ἔνθα μαινάδες
> καθῆντ' ἔχουσαι χεῖρας ἐν τερπνοῖς πόνοις.

> There was a glen enclosed by cliffs, with water running through, overshadowed by pines, where the maenads were seated, occupying their hands in pleasant tasks.
>
> (*Ba.* 1051-3, transl. G.S. Kirk)

This scenery meets all the requirements of the *locus amoenus* (water, shade and trees), fitting in with the Maenads' peaceful occupation at that moment, which consists in mending their maenadic equipment. At the same time all the elements of this charming decor will later play a part in the dramatic events: Pentheus expresses a desire to climb a pine tree and with the miraculous help of Dionysus manages to do so, but in such a way as to become only too visible to the Maenads (1075, 1095). Incited by Dionysus they cross the water mentioned in 1051 (1093: διὰ ... χειμάρρου νάπης) and start attacking the tree with stones, while occupying a cliff 'towering opposite' (1097: ἀντίπυργον ... πέτραν) — here the relevance of ἀμφίκρημνον (1051) becomes apparent. In 1098-

[99] Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1948: 128; "Past them [the villages] goes Pentheus to meet the fate that has already been foreshadowed by their fate".

[100] Other instances of this formula in messenger-speeches are: *Hipp.* 1199, *HF* 922, *IT* 262, and cf. S. *Tr.* 752-3. The Homeric instances are collected and discussed in Kahn 245-9.

1104 the Maenads use their oak and pine branches, and of course the thyrsus, as weapons and digging-instruments against Pentheus. The last time the scenery of Mt. Cithaeron is evoked in this messenger-speech is in 1137-8, where the Messenger tells how the parts of Pentheus' body, after the *sparagmos*, lie scattered 'under sharp rocks' (ὑπὸ στύφλοις πέτραις) or 'among deep-wooded foliage of the woods' (ὕλης ἐν βαθυξύλῳ φόβῃ). One last time — cf. earlier 726-7, 1084-5 — nature seems to align with maenadism, since the sharpness of the rocks and the thickness of the foliage make it not easy to collect Pentheus' remains: οὐ ῥᾴδιον ζήτημα (1139). In 1216-21 we are given a short report on the search by the one who has carried it out, Cadmus, in which both rocks and trees recur: ἐν Κιθαιρῶνος πτυχαῖς (1219), ἐν ὕλῃ ... δυσευρέτῳ (1221).[101]

(iv) Objects

"Props and costumes are a particularly straightforward means for the dramatist to put his meaning into tangible, overt form. As with all stage-business the Greek tragedians are sparing in their use of stage-properties, but this very economy throws more emphasis on their employment."[102] Although the messenger-speeches are more crowded with objects (chariots, weapons, cups, etc.), these objects may also be significant.

In the messenger-speech in *Med.*, of course, Medea's treacherous gifts play a major role. They are not introduced or described by the Messenger at the beginning of his story, since the spectators had already been told about them on several occasions (786: λεπτὸν ... πέπλον, πλόκον χρυσήλατον; 787, 951, 954, 981: κόσμον; 978: χρυσέων ἀναδεσμᾶν, and 983-4: πέπλον, χρυσότευκτον στέφανον), and had even seen them in 956 (φερνὰς τάσδε). They are referred to for the first time by Jason in 1154: δέξῃ ... δῶρα. Only when he describes how the princess puts on the gifts and the poison takes effect, both on her and on Creon, does

[101] δυσευρέτῳ clearly mirrors οὐ ῥᾴδιον ζήτημα (1139), and need not be taken as a hypallage, as Roux ad 1216-21 does.

[102] Taplin 1978: 77 and cf. Pfister 273: "plays that tend towards neutrality [of space] or a high level of stylisation use a very small number of props, but the ones they do use are all the more important because of this. This was already the case in classical Greek tragedy ..."

the Messenger draw attention to the texture of the objects (the golden crown: 1160, 1186, 1193; the fine dress: 1188, 1214), thus stressing precisely those aspects of the gifts which proved fatal to the princess. As Medea (964) and the chorus (983-4) had foreseen, the princess was not able to withstand the glitter of the golden crown and the elegance of the fine dress.

As regards the messenger-speech in *Hipp.*, I have already pointed out (p. 84) the significance of objects like 'bits hardened in steel' (1223), 'the tightly constructed chariot' (1225), 'leather thongs cut artfully' (1245). They emphasize the tragedy of Hippolytus, who is brought down by his own beloved horses and treasured chariot.

In the messenger-speech in *Andr.* the attacking Delphians use not only regular weapons against Neoptolemus, but also utensils such as 'two-pointed spits' which are normally employed to sacrifice oxen (1133-4). Once more — see pp. 82-3, 152-3 — the Messenger makes it clear that Delphi's holiness is being abused by making it the place of a murder.[103] The detailed enumeration of the different types of missiles also depicts the fierceness of the attack on Neoptolemus (cf. earlier πυκνῇ ... νιφάδι: 1129 and πόλλ' ὁμοῦ βέλη: 1132).[104]

The messenger-speech in *Supp.*, as it is the description of a battle, is of course full of chariots, steel and weaponry, but at the height of Theseus' aristeia (707-17) we find a reference to 'the fearful mace from Epidaurus' (714-5), i.e. the mace which belonged to one of his earlier victims, Periphetes the robber of Epidaurus. Thanks to this reference, Theseus, who had been portrayed thus far as a contemporary general, suddenly becomes the hero of legend. The effect is of course to enhance the positive picture of what the Messenger considers the ideal general.[105]

In the messenger-speech in *El.* Euripides lays, as has been well analyzed by Arnott 1973: 56, "a trail of possible murder weapons". In

[103] Now one might say, as Burnett 1971: 152 does, that Neoptolemus, too, abuses sacred Delphian objects, since in 1121-3 he grabs a votive armoury, puts it on and jumps on top of an altar. He, however, is clearly forced to do so by the Delphians, who attack him while he is alone and unarmed.

[104] I therefore disagree with Barlow 1971: 65, who calls this "an *impersonal* description of the many weapons coming at him" (my italics).

[105] Cf. p. 106.

810-1 Aegisthus takes a 'straight-bladed sacrificial knife' (ὀρθὴν σφαγίδα), kills the sacrificial bull and then hands over the knife to Orestes (λαβὲ σίδηρον: 817). Orestes takes the 'well-beaten Doric blade' (εὐκρότητον Δωρίδ': 819) and the suspense heightens.[106] Will he kill Aegisthus? No, he flays and dismembers the bull's carcass with it. In 836-7 Orestes asks for another weapon, 'a Phthian instead of a Doric cleaver' (Φθιάδ' ἀντὶ Δωρικῆς ... κοπίδ') to smash the bull's breast bone.[107] Will he kill Aegisthus now? No, he takes the cleaver and smashes ... the bull's breastbone (838). Only then does he, finally, strike Aegisthus (839ff.).

In his madness Heracles uses his famous weapons, bow and club, against his own children. Both weapons had been seen by the spectators in *HF* 523ff., as is clear from 570 (τῷ καλλινίκῳ τῷδ' ὅπλῳ). Heracles' weapons symbolize his earlier triumphs,[108] and having him kill his own children with these 'ever ready' weapons[109] produces the same kind of dramatic effect as having Hippolytus die through his own horses and chariot. In 1378-85 Heracles even considers taking leave of his legendary weapons, which, he fears, will constantly remind him of the fact that he murdered his wife and children with them.

In *IT* Orestes went out to get hold of the statue of Artemis (87), but returns with the statue and his sister.[110] The statue was seen by the

[106] The use of an epithet ('well-beaten'), in particular, suggests that this is the knife which will be used to murder Aegisthus (see p. 86 for the use of epithets to increase tension).

[107] Why this other weapon? 1) Denniston: "Orestes wants to get a heavier weapon into his hands"; 2) Cropp: Euripides perhaps influenced by A. *Ch.* 860; 3) Bremer (personal communication): this butcher's knife symbolizes the descent from a heroic level to the ugly realism of Orestes butchering Aegisthus; 4) myself: Orestes feels very sure of himself and wishes to push a bit further the irony of Aegisthus willingly providing his own murder weapon.

[108] The epithet καλλίνικος is used in 49 and 570 of Heracles' weapons; elsewhere (582, 789, 961, 1046) it refers to Heracles himself, and is "the most important of the titles applied to Heracles both in cult ... and in literature ..." (Bond ad 582).

[109] Cf. p. 86 on φαρέτραν ... εὐτρεπῆ.

[110] Note that the plural in 1388-9 (ἔχομεν ... ὧνπερ οὕνεκ' ... εἰσεπλεύσαμεν) — I take the βοή τις (1386) to derive from Orestes — are therefore spoken from an *ex eventu* point of view. In 1012-6 Orestes had already pronounced to Iphigeneia his conviction that from the very beginning it must have been Apollo's intention to

spectators in 1157ff., as is clear from 1157-8 (τόδε ... θεᾶς ἄγαλμ'). In the second messenger-speech the statue is mentioned (1359: ξοάνα, 1384-5: τό ... οὐρανοῦ πέσημα, τῆς Διὸς κόρης ἄγαλμα), but the emphasis is understandably on Iphigeneia, the heroine of the play: it is her — and Orestes — whom the Messenger urges Thoas to capture (1416-9).

In the case of the messenger-speech in *Ion*, the cup containing the poisoned wine was seen by the spectators in 1029ff. (χρύσωμ' Ἀθάνας τόδε, παλαιὸν ὄργανον: 1030). The Messenger describes the cup as 'especially chosen' (ἐξαίρετον: 1182), viz. by the Old Man, who pretends to offer Ion this special cup by way of doing him, his new master, a favour (1183).

In *Ph.* (2) we have the detailed description of the shields of the Seven (1104-38), a description which Polyneices had refused to give in 751-2. For this passage as an intertextual *tour de force* of Euripides, see Said 506-9; for symbolic interpretations of some of the shields, see Foley 1985: 128.

And finally, as regards *Ba.* (2), I have already drawn attention to the Maenads' use of their ritual oak and pine branches and thyrsus as weapons and instruments (1098-1104). This action had been foreshadowed in *Ba.* (1): 762-4 (θύρσους ἐξανιεῖσαι χερῶν); and the potential use of the thyrsus as weapon had been referred to in 25 (κίσσινον βέλος) and 113 (νάρθηκας ὑβριστάς).

(v) Mediation

Perhaps the most fundamental difference between narrative and drama is the presence/absence of a narrator:

> whilst the receiver of a dramatic text feels directly confronted with the characters represented, in narrative texts they are mediated by a more or less concrete narrator figure.[111]

In the previous chapters we have seen the importance of this mediation in the case of the messenger-speech, resulting as it does in at the very

bring together brother and sister.

[111] Pfister 3. The distinction is as old as Plato and Aristotle: see De Jong 1987a: 2-8.

least a filtered, sometimes a partial, and often an emotional account. In this subsection I will deal with a different aspect of this mediation, viz. the role of the messenger as 'exegetical' medium, explaining why people act as they act. There is one messenger-speech particularly suited to illustrate this aspect, that of *HF*, which describes Heracles' madness, and it is this text on which the discussion will concentrate.[112]

First, however, it may be instructive to examine the figure of Orestes, whose madness is presented once offstage (in *IT* (2)), and once onstage (in *Or.*).[113] In *IT* 281-314 the Messenger describes how one of the two strangers, whom the spectators will recognize as Orestes, is suddenly seized with a fit of madness (μανίαις: 284). The first symptoms of his madness are physical: 'he threw his head upwards and downwards, and trembling with his whole arms he started to shout, wandering about through his madness' (282-4). The particular nature of this madness is soon clear from the words of the stranger himself, quoted in direct speech by the Messenger: the Erinyes of his mother are attacking him (285-91). The madman alone sees these Erinyes; his urgent questions to Pylades in 285-7 (δέδορκας τήνδε; τήνδε δ' οὐχ ὁρᾷς Ἅιδου δράκαιναν ...;) are answered, as it were, by the Messenger in 291-2 (παρῆν δ' ὁρᾶν οὐ ταῦτα μορφῆς σχήματ'). In 292-4[114] the Messenger proceeds to give a description of the stranger's behaviour ('he was spinning from the voices of calves and the barking of dogs'), and making use of the information provided by the stranger's speech in 285-91, he explains it in terms of the Erinyes delusion: 'thinking (φάσκων) that the Erinyes produced the lowing'. Then the stranger starts attacking the calves (296-7) and again the Messenger adds an explanation: 'thinking (δοκῶν) that in this way he could ward off the Erinyes' (299). In 315 the fit of madness subsides. We see that the offstage presentation of Orestes' madness comprises three elements: (1) description of the physical symptoms and actions of the madman which signal his madness; (2) quotation of the words of the madman, which show the

[112] For other examples I refer to my discussion in Ch. 1, pp. 24-9 of the messenger's inferences about what other characters see, think, intend, etc., in short their motives for acting the way they do.

[113] And compare Pentheus' onstage and offstage delusion.

[114] The text is uncertain. I follow Diggle's suggestions of reading εἱλίσσετο (292), φθογγαῖς ... ὑλάγμασιν (293), φάσκων ... μυκήματα (294).

particular nature of his madness (delusion); (3) explanation by the Messenger of the actions of the madman in terms of his delusion: he did x, thinking he was doing y.

What happens when such a fit of madness is presented onstage? The answer may be learnt from *Or.* 253-76: here, too, we have a description of physical symptoms, now given by Electra (253: 'oh my dear brother, your eye is becoming disturbed'); again we hear of Orestes seeing things which are not seen by others (273-4: Orestes to Electra: 'can't you see the feathered shafts speeding out from the far-shooting bow?'; 258-9: Electra to Orestes: 'you're not seeing any of the things you think (δοκεῖς) you're sure of'). Again we have the madman's words, now not quoted by another, but spoken by himself (255-7, etc.). What is lacking, however, are the exegetical explanations of the 'he did x, thinking he was doing y' type. Apparently, the combination of gestures and words suffice to make clear the delusion. Thus a line like 264 (Orestes to Electra: 'Let go! You're one of my Erinyes') would have had to be reported by a messenger as: Orestes freed himself from his sister's embrace, thinking she was one of his Erinyes. We will see that in the messenger-speech in *HF,* to which I now turn, the possibilities of the exegetical explanation, of juxtaposing mad actions and the delusion underlying those actions, are exploited to the full.

Heracles' madness begins, like that of Orestes, with physical symptoms (931-4):[115] his eyes roll and become bloodshot, and foam appears at his mouth.[116] In a long speech (936-46) he announces that he will go to Mycenae to kill Eurystheus, and will only then perform the purificatory rites he had just begun. This speech provides the Messenger with the information necessary to interpret the mad behaviour which Heracles is soon to display. The speech in itself is not completely 'mad', and at this stage Heracles still recognizes his father (936: πάτερ) and knows where he is and what he is doing (936: τί θύω;). But the

[115] For a refutation of the idea, advocated e.g. by Wilamowitz and Grube, that Heracles has been mad from the beginning, that is from the moment he enters the stage in 523, see Burnett 1971: 170-1, n. 20. We have only to consider the words with which the Messenger begins his description in 931: ὁ δ' οὐκέθ' αὑτὸς ἦν.

[116] Cf. Lyssa's description in 868. Three other symptoms mentioned by her in 867-70 (shaking of the head, groaning and irregular breathing) are not reported by the Messenger.

'deranged laughter' which accompanies his words (935: ἅμα γέλωτι παραπεπληγμένῳ) and certain details of his announcement already point to insanity: he intends not only to kill Eurystheus (936: κτανεῖν Εὐρυσθέα), but also to bring back his head (939: ἐνέγκω ... κρᾶτ' Εὐρυσθέως); he not only interrupts the purificatory sacrifice, but commands his servants 'to pour out the libations and throw away the baskets' (941: ἐκχεῖτε πηγάς, ῥίπτετ' ἐκ χειρῶν κανᾶ); he not only asks for his bow and club (942), but also for 'crowbars and picks' (944) to destroy the Cyclopean walls of Mycenae. As Bond remarks (310, ad 930-1009), Heracles is now beginning to suffer from "megalomaniac delusions". What no commentator has remarked upon is the verb used for 'to destroy': συντριαινῶσαι. This verb is a Euripidean *hapax*; it is otherwise found only once in Plato comicus, *fr.* 24 (Kock), naturally in connection with Poseidon. Its use in *HF* 946 adds a special flavour to Heracles' megalomania: he thinks himself endowed with divine forces.

In 947 Heracles starts his imaginary journey to Mycenae:

> ἐκ τοῦδε βαίνων ἅρματ' οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν
> ἔφασκε δίφρου τ' εἰσέβαινεν ἄντυγα
> κἄθεινε, κέντρῳ δῆθεν ὡς θείνων, χερί.
>
> Thereafter beginning to move he said he had a chariot, though he did not, and he 'mounted the rail of the vehicle' and he struck with his hand, as if striking with a whip.
>
> (*HF* 947-9)

Here for the first time the Messenger intervenes as explaining medium: he carefully distinguishes between what was really happening (οὐκ ἔχων, ἔθεινε ... χερί) and what Heracles thought he was doing (ἅρματ' ... ἔχειν ἔφασκε, κέντρῳ δῆθεν ὡς θείνων).[117] The sentence δίφρου εἰσέβαινεν ἄντυγα lacks such a commentary by the Messenger, but as it is wedged in between the other two, which are commented upon,

[117] Bond's formulation ad 947-9 is unfortunate: "The narrative glides from correct description ... to imaginary description ... and back again to correct description". It is not the description which is correct or imaginary, but the *object* of that description. Note δῆθεν as the Messenger's signal of Heracles' delusion, cf. Denniston 1954: 265, (3): "δῆθεν with ὡς and participle implying that a supposition is mistaken" (he mentions this place).

it will be clear that here, too, we are dealing with Heracles' imagination (hence the inverted commas in my translation).

By now the servants have seen enough to know that their master is behaving strangely, but they are not yet sure whether he is merely playing or has actually gone mad (950-2). Then

> ὁ δ' εἷρπ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω στέγας,
> μέσον δ' ἐς ἀνδρῶν' ἐσπεσὼν Νίσου πόλιν
> ἥκειν ἔφασκε, δωμάτων τ' ἔσω βεβὼς
> κλιθεὶς ἐς οὖδας ὡς ἔχει σκευάζεται
> θοίνην.
>
> He [Heracles] started to walk to and fro in the house, and having burst into the men's hall he declared he had reached the city of king Nisus [Megara], and having stepped into 'the house' he 'prepares to feast', reclining on the floor without further ado.
>
> (*HF* 953-7)

Even when we accept Wilamowitz' reading (with τε after δωμάτων and without δε after κλιθείς) it is still possible,[118] and, I think, preferable to take δωμάτων ἔσω as describing Heracles' imagination (hence my inverted commas in the translation): he thinks he has entered Nisus' house, whereas in fact he has entered one of the smaller rooms opening off the men's hall in his own house. The exegetical intervention of the Messenger in this passage consists of ὡς ἔχει, which I connect to κλιθεὶς ἐς οὖδας:[119] a sane Heracles would have reclined on a couch (κλίνη) to eat,[120] but in his madness he reclines on the bare floor 'without further ado', i.e. without even noticing it. After a short while Heracles announces that he is going to the Isthmus:

> κἀνταῦθα γυμνὸν σῶμα θεὶς πορπαμάτων
> πρὸς οὐδέν' ἡμιλλᾶτο κἀκηρύσσετο
> αὐτὸς πρὸς αὑτοῦ καλλίνικος οὐδενός,
> ἀκοὴν ὑπειπών.

[118] See Bond's discussion ad 954-7.

[119] Wilamowitz connects it with σκευάζεται θοίνην and takes it as an indication that Heracles only thinks he is preparing to feast.

[120] Bond ad 954-7 interprets κλιθεὶς ἐς οὖδας as Heracles lying down to sleep. The θοίνην then must be a breakfast (and indeed Wilamowitz ad 956 speaks of "Frühstuck"), which is, however, not the normal meaning of the word.

> And 'there' he stripped his body naked of his garments and competed with no person and was announced by his own self victor over no person, commanding a hearing.
>
> (*HF* 959-62)

The ἐνταῦθα corresponds, of course, to Heracles' imagination: he thinks he is at the Isthmus. The undoing of his clothing, the competing and the announcing are really performed by him, whereas the additions πρὸς οὐδέν', οὐδενός derive from the Messenger.

So far Heracles' madness has been eery to watch, but in itself harmless. However, upon arriving (in his imagination: τῷ λόγῳ) in Mycenae, all that changes: he starts uttering threats against Eurystheus (962-3). At this point Heracles' father intervenes, and grabbing his son's strong hand, asks what is wrong with him (965-7). Heracles' madness now has reached such a state that he no longer recognizes his own father:

> ὁ δέ νιν Εὐρυσθέως δοκῶν
> πατέρα προταρβοῦνθ' ἱκέσιον ψαύειν χερὸς
> ὠθεῖ
>
> But he pushes him away, thinking that it was Eurystheus' father, who, fearing for his son's life, touched his hand in supplication
>
> (*HF* 967-9)

Here we have the first δοκῶν-clause. In it the Messenger supplies Heracles' deluded reason for pushing away his own father: Heracles did x, thinking he was doing y. It seems to be symptomatic of Heracles' madness that he does realize the ages of the people around him, but not their identity: his own father he takes to be Eurystheus' father; his own sons he will take to be Eurystheus' sons. In addition to the failure to recognize his own father, Heracles' madness has also evolved in another way: he has lost his sense of normal human decency, pushing away someone who is supplicating him (ἱκέσιον). This rude gesture will soon take a more dramatic form when he kills his own son, who also supplicates him (986-94). Note a pattern which can be observed here and throughout the whole story: words spoken by bystanders are followed by a ὁ δέ-clause in which we are told how Heracles, disregarding the words just addressed to him, continues with the execution of his mad plan: 953

(after servants' speech), 967 (after Amphitryon's speech), 977 (after Megara's speech), 990 (after second son's speech).

Heracles now readies his bow against his own children, 'thinking (δοκῶν) he was killing Eurystheus' sons' (970-1). The δοκῶν-clause contrasts with ἑαυτοῦ, which — in itself emphatic[121] — is thereby given even more stress. This time Heracles' wife intervenes, appealing — in vain — to his feelings as a father (975-6): τέκων, you are killing your τέκνα. Heracles kills his first son (977-80) and the triumphant words he speaks (982-3) are the height of dramatic irony.[122] He now directs his bow at his second son, who has crouched down, thinking to escape his father's notice. This son is the third person — after Amphitryon in 965-7 and Megara in 975-6 — to appeal to Heracles, and since Heracles' words in 982-3 have made clear to all that he thinks he is dealing with Eurystheus' sons, the son explicitly points out this delusion, in the hope of opening Heracles' eyes:

σός εἰμι, σὸς παῖς· οὐ τὸν Εὐρυσθέως ὀλεῖς.

I am yours, your son. You are not about to kill Eurystheus' son.

(*HF* 989)

But Heracles is still raving mad, as the description of the physical symptom in 990 (ὁ δ' ἀγριωπὸν ὄμμα Γοργόνος στρέφων) tells us, and he proceeds to kill his second son as well. And then

δεύτερον δὲ παῖδ' ἑλὼν
χωρεῖ τρίτον θῦμ' ὡς ἐπισφάξων δυοῖν.

having killed his second son he advances to slaughter a third victim in addition to the other two.

(*HF* 994-5)

"The use of these *bona verba* [θῦμα, ἐπισφάξων] here is a deliberate blasphemy", writes Bond ad 995. But whose blasphemy is it? Certainly not of the speaker, the Messenger. The final ὡς + participle-clause must

[121] See Bond *ad loc.*

[122] Cf. Erdmann 128 ("Der Triumph des Herakles nach dem Tode des ersten Kindes ist extrem tragische Ironie"), and above p. 89 (on νεοσσός: 982), and p. 145 (on ἠλάλαξε κἀπεκόμπασεν: 981).

be interpreted as expressing Heracles' focalization,[123] and we are dealing not so much with conscious blasphemy, as with another manifestation of his delusion: he considers his killing of 'Eurystheus' sons' as a justified sacrifice on the altar of vengeance.[124] Earlier Megara had referred to her children, who were about to be killed by Lycus, as τὰ θύματ' εἰς Ἅιδου τάδε (453). The repetition of θῦμα in 995 emphasizes the horror of what is taking place: Heracles, who had just prevented his children from becoming Lycus' victim, now sacrifices them himself.[125]

Megara manages, for the time being, to save her third son's life by shutting him and herself up in a room and bolting the door (996-7). Heracles' crowbars and picks now prove their worth and he starts carrying out his threat, voiced in 944-6, to raze the Cyclopian walls:

> ὁ δ' ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δὴ Κυκλωπίοισιν ὢν
> σκάπτει μοχλεύει θύρετρα κἀκβαλὼν σταθμὰ
> δάμαρτα καὶ παῖδ' ἑνὶ κατέστρωσεν βέλει.
>
> But he digs, uproots the doors, as if he really was at the Cyclopian walls, and having forced out the door-posts he laid low his wife and son with one blow.
>
> (*HF* 998-1000)

Once more, reality (θύρετρα, σταθμά) and imagination (ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δὴ Κυκλωπίοισιν ὤν)[126] are carefully separated by the Messenger, while the verbs σκάπτει and μόχλευει are suited to both imagination and reality.

Having killed his wife and third son, Heracles 'gallops' (ἱππεύει: 1001) — one more sign that his madness has not abated — towards his

[123] For the interpretation of final clauses as secondary or embedded focalization, see De Jong 1987a: 111.

[124] Note that Heracles' murder of Lycus is described by the chorus in 735-814 as an act of divine justice (see in particular 737, 773-5, 813-5). Heracles seems to consider 'the murder of Eurystheus' family' something similar.

[125] See Foley 1985: 153-4, 158. Cf. also Bremer's analysis (1972) of the possible ambiguity in the words spoken earlier by Heracles: τῶν δ' ἐμῶν τέκνων οὐκ ἐκπονήσω θάνατον (580-1).

[126] Note δή: "δή hebt die Wahnvorstellung noch besonders hervor" (Wilamowitz 1959); cf. δῆθεν in 949.

father, who is, however, saved by Athena's intervention. The goddess throws a rock at Heracles, causing him to fall asleep, a sleep which the sympathizing Messenger qualifies as οὐκ εὐδαίμονα (1013). In 1089 Heracles will awaken onstage, and behave normally again.

The almost continuous insight we are given in this messenger-speech into Heracles' deranged mind, both through the quotation of his words in direct and indirect speech and by the numerous interventions by the Messenger as explaining medium, makes it possible for us to grasp the particular horror of his madness:[127] while killing his own family he thinks he is killing Eurystheus' family. Thus to him this delusion appears real, justified and even attractive.[128] If he had really killed the family of Eurystheus, his arch-enemy, this would have been understandable and to a degree acceptable, just as his murder of Lycus is deemed by all characters to be acceptable. In addition, his insanity is only a shade removed from his 'normal' behaviour, which is violent and often uncontrolled. I recall the violent punishment he had in mind for his own citizens, the Thebans, who had not assisted his family during his absence: 568-73. On that occasion his father was still able to control him ... (585-6). In short, Heracles' madness consists of an excessive degree of his 'normal' heroic temper,[129] and as such it prepares us for his change from god-hero to man, which, as we saw on p. 129, is the main theme of this play.

[127] I cannot agree with Burnett 1971: 171, n. 20 that Heracles' madness manifests "the gods' usual tact" in these matters.

[128] Though I do not agree with all the details, I have made use of Burnett's analysis (1971: 170): "Heracles' real crime is a thing wholly imposed and external to him, but the illusory deed ... is in a sense still the hero's own. Lyssa has used the Mycenaean murders as a distraction; they dazzle Heracles and keep his troubled mind from recognizing the real work of his hand, and they can do this because they are attractive to him. Indeed, these imaginary killings are not unlike the killing of Lycus and his men."; cf. also Barlow 1982: 122 ("his delusion is related to his earlier public image").

[129] This also seems to be Heracles' own view, for he says in 1279-80 that killing his children was his last labour.

3.4 Conclusion. Telling versus showing.

It seems appropriate to commence these concluding remarks with a well-known passage from Horace:

Aut agitur res in scaenis aut acta refertur.
segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus et quae
ipse sibi tradit spectator.

Actions may be either performed on stage or reported when performed. What comes in through the ear is less effective in stirring the mind than what is put before our faithful eyes and told by the spectator to himself.
(*Ars Poetica* 179-82, transl. D.A. Russell)

In other words, Horace maintains that telling (the messenger-speech) stirs the mind of the spectator *less* than showing (enacted drama). This opinion seems backed up by several Sophoclean messengers, e.g.:

μᾶλλον δ' εἰ παροῦσα πλησία
ἔλευσσες οἷ' ἔδρασε, κάρτ' ἂν ᾤκτισας.

hadst thou been an eye-witness of the action, verily thy pity would have been yet deeper.
(S. *Tr.* 896-7, transl. R.C. Jebb)[130]

Without wishing to diminish the value of these statements, I suggest that another aspect of the opposition between seeing and hearing is at work here, viz. the idea that autopsy is a more reliable source of information than hearsay (see p. 11). Note in particular in the quotation from Horace *oculis ... fidelibus*. Both aspects (emotional stirring and authenticity) are combined in:

αὐτὸς βαρεῖαν ξυμφορὰν ἐν ὄμμασιν
πατρὸς δεδορκὼς κοὺ κατὰ γλῶσσαν κλύων.

I have seen my father's grievous fate with mine own eyes; I speak not from hearsay.
(S. *Tr.* 746-8, transl. R.C. Jebb)

[130] And cf. *El.* 761-3, *OT* 1237-8.

The opposite view, according to which telling is *more* effective than showing, is held by De Romilly (1961: 132): "Le récit insiste plus que le spectacle direct ne pouvait faire", (1986: 91): " ... parfois une scène est plus pathétique encore de n'être pas directement montrée"; Pathmanathan 6: "It is a commonplace of stage-craft that horror can be conveyed more effectively through the suggestive power of words or the imagination than actual spectacle"; Walcot 33: "The combination of the messenger's words and the spectator's imagination was more effective in the ancient theatre than physical action on the stage"; Barlow 1986: 14: "It would be a mistake to think of the messenger's report as a poor substitute which fails to make up for what cannot be shown on stage. On the contrary it is superior to spectacle."[131]

Rather than choose between drama and narrative, as Aristotle and Th. Mann do, or simply pronounce that telling is more or less effective than showing, as Horace and the others just quoted do, I will try to strike a balance between the two.

Both enacted drama and the messenger-speech deal with the four categories of (1) time (2) place, (3) people, and (4) events.[132]

1. In drama time is more restricted than in narrative. Even allowing for a certain fluidity of time,[133] the action of Greek drama very seldom exceeds a period of a day or days, whereas in theory narrative can span any period of time. This temporal flexibility is exploited in the narratives of the Euripidean prologues and certain choral songs, but not in the messenger-speech. The latter covers events which have only just taken place and which take up a period of hours or perhaps days, but never years.

2. As we have seen, the offstage scenery of the messenger-speech is generally described just as briefly and allusively as the onstage scenery. However, those details which are mentioned are invariably relevant to the messenger's story (Alcestis moving through Admetus' house, Hippolytus meeting with disaster on the shore where he used to race his horses, holy Delphi being abused for the murder of Neoptolemus, etc.).

[131] For a more moderate view, see Heath 153: "If his descriptive and narrative rhetoric is powerful enough, the dramatist can overcome these technical limitations, extending his field of operation without loss of emotive and dramatic force."

[132] For these categories, cf. Bal 7 and Elam 98.

[133] For time in Greek tragedy, see Taplin 1977: 290-3.

In the messenger-speeches of *HF*, *Ion* and *Ba.* (1) and (2) the scenic background even plays a major role in the course of events.

3. Where its 'cast' is concerned, the messenger-speech clearly differs from enacted drama in that it can introduce crowds or 'new' characters who play no role on stage (e.g. Neoptolemus in the messenger-speech in *Andr.*).[134]

4. The fact that the messenger-speech can present certain types of events (murders, miracles, battles) which enacted drama cannot or would not, is one of its *raisons d'être*.

Time, place, people and events are all objects of presentation; I turn now to the presentation itself. Here the difference between enacted drama and messenger-speech is eminently manifest: we have directness versus mediation, i.e. the spectators seeing/hearing things themselves versus seeing/hearing them through the messenger. Is this lack of immediacy always a disadvantage? Let us recapitulate:

– words: the possibility which a narrative has of quoting a character's words in direct speech lends immediacy and makes it seem as if we are hearing that character himself speak. The Euripidean messenger makes abundant use of this technique.

– miens: these have to be described by others both onstage and in the messenger's report. Euripides only seldom makes more than average use of the descriptive possibilities of the narrative medium as far as miens are concerned (I recall the series of facial expressions displayed by Creon's daughter in *Med.*, and the brothers Eteocles and Polyneices as they gaze off in the direction of Thebes and Argos respectively in *Ph.*).

– gestures: here, too, there is not a great deal of difference between showing and telling, since onstage gestures are in general not only mimed but also referred to with words, and hence have a verbal nature as well. Only Polyxena's baring her breasts in the messenger-speech in *Hec.* is a gesture which could not have been performed onstage (by a male actor), and the wordless signs emitted by the dying Eteocles are likewise more easily described than enacted.

– tone: in a messenger-speech the tone in which quoted words are spoken must be indicated *expressis verbis* by the messenger. These speech-introductions offer the possibility of more refined effects, a

[134] See for this second category my article on off-stage characters: de Jong 1990.

possibility which is only seldom exploited by Euripides — far less, in fact, than in Homer.[135] He favours short and neutral speech-introductions of the type 'he said' and in fewer than half of the cases does he give a more concrete indication, such as 'he shouted', 'he begged', etc. An effective speech-introduction is to be found in the messenger-speech in *HF*, when Heracles, at the height of his madness, 'shouted victory and boasted' over the death of his own son.

– sound: in a messenger-speech sounds are hardly ever recorded for themselves alone, but rather because they are frightening (*Hipp.*), or impressive (*Heracl.*), or repulsive (*Andr.*). The sinister silences before the storm in the messenger-speeches of *Andr.*, *HF*, *Ion*, and *Ba.* (2) are, I think, peculiar to the messenger-speech. A similar effect on stage would be impossible: to mention a silence is to break it.[136]

– mediation: in the case of an onstage character, we only know what we hear, that is, we do not know what he or she is thinking apart from what is said aloud.[137] It is a prerogative of narrative texts to present characters' unspoken thoughts too, either as fact (in the case of an omniscient narrator), or as inference (in the case of a first person narrator). This prerogative is exploited to the utmost and with great effect in the messenger-speech in *HF*: throughout the Messenger informs us not only of what Heracles in his madness is doing but also what he, Heracles, *thinks* he is doing. This double perspective enables us to grasp fully the horror and the treacherous appeal which his madness holds for Heracles himself.

There are two more aspects of this mediation which should be mentioned in this systematic *synkrisis* of narrative and enacted drama. In the first place, there is the emotional filtering which is inherent in the messenger's focalization. This aspect has been analyzed in full in Chapter two, and the following passage will make my point better than any summary:

πίτνει δ' ἐς οὖδας συμφορᾷ νικωμένη,
πλὴν τῷ τεκόντι κάρτα δυσμαθὴς ἰδεῖν·

[135] See De Jong 1987a: 195-208.

[136] Of course, we have onstage silences in the form of persons who are silent (*Hipp.* 297, *Ph.* 960; S. *OC* 1271, etc.).

[137] Of course, there is the technique of the 'aside', for which see Bain.

οὔτ' ὀμμάτων γὰρ δῆλος ἦν κατάστασις
οὔτ' εὐφυὲς πρόσωπον, αἷμα δ' ἐξ ἄκρου
ἔσταζε κρατὸς συμπεφυρμένον πυρί,
σάρκες δ' ἀπ' ὀστέων ὥστε πεύκινον δάκρυ
γνάθοις ἀδήλοις φαρμάκων ἀπέρρεον,
δεινὸν θέαμα.

She [Creon's daughter] falls on the ground overcome by her disaster, very difficult to recognize except for her father: for neither the state of her eyes nor her shapely face were recognizable (anymore), but blood mingled with fire dripped from the top of her head and her flesh streamed from her bones like resinous tears through the invisible jaws of the poison, a terrible sight. (*Med.* 1195-1202)

The Messenger's focalization transpires in συμφορᾷ (he considers the princess' fate a disaster), νικωμένη (recalls ἐπεστρατεύετο in 1185, and paints the princess as a victim of Medea's aggression), εὐφυὲς πρόσωπον (the highly pathetic 'beauty brought low' motif), ὥστε πεύκινον δάκρυ (the comparison subtly introduces the notion of tears), γνάθοις (the metaphor stresses once more the violence of the princess' death: it is as if she were being devoured by a wild beast), ἀδήλοις (stresses the treacherous nature of Medea's weapon, poison), and finally in the explicit emotional comment δεινὸν θέαμα.

Moreover, the very fact that events have to be described, have to be put into words, may increase their impact. Take, for example, the following passage from the messenger-speech in *El.*:

τοῦ δὲ νεύοντος κάτω
ὄνυχας ἐπ' ἄκρους στὰς κασίγνητος σέθεν
ἐς σφονδύλους ἔπαισε, νωτιαῖα δὲ
ἔρρηξεν ἄρθρα· πᾶν δὲ σῶμ' ἄνω κάτω
ἤσπαιρεν ἠλέλιζε δυσθνῄσκων φόνῳ.

And as he [Aegisthus] was leaning down, your brother raised himself on the tips of his toes and smote at his spine, smashing the vertebrae; his body was all convulsed, heaving, writhing in hard and bloody death. (*El.* 839-43, transl. M.J. Cropp)

The Messenger is a servant of Orestes and certainly not bent upon incriminating his master. Note the proud 'you' denomination κασίγνητος σέθεν, the effect of which seems to be to remind Electra that it was

after all her 'little brother', who onstage had been so irresolute, and about whose success she had been so worried, who now accomplishes this 'heroic' feat. And yet the realistic description of the effects of the death blow seems intended by Euripides to make Orestes' act seem repulsive.[138]

I conclude, then, that the narrativity of the messenger-speech is never a handicap or disadvantage, often an instrument expertly wielded by the dramatist Euripides, and at times a means to create very special and impressive results. In short, as Murray 214 says, "the messenger-speech was — and still is on the stage — immensely dramatic and effective."

[138] Cf. Arnott 1981: 187.

APPENDIX A

AN INVENTORY OF MESSENGER-SPEECHES IN EURIPIDES

Alc.		152-98
Med.		1136-1230*
Heracl.		799-866
Hipp.		1173-1254
Andr.		1085-1165*
Hec.		518-82
Supp.		650-730
El.		774-858*
HF		922-1015*
IT	(1)	260-339
	(2)	1327-1419*
Ion		1122-1228*
Hel.	(1)	605-621
	(2)	1526-1618*
Ph.	(1)	1090-1199
	(2)	1217-1263
	(3)	1356-1424
	(4)	1427-1479
Or.	(1)	866-956
	(2)	1395-1502*
Ba.	(1)	677-774
	(2)	1043-1152*

Criteria

My corpus coincides with that of Erdmann and Rijksbaron 1976a, except for *IA* 414-39, which they include, and I have excluded for reasons which will be explained below. The messenger-speeches of *Rh.* 756-804, *Cyc.* 382-436 and *IA* 1540-1613 will be disregarded. My criteria for considering a speech a messenger-speech are: (1) identity of speaker (not one of the protagonists, but an (ἐξ)ἄγγελος, θεράπων, βουκόλος, once

Talthybius), (2) narrative content (verbs in the past), and (3) presence of introductory dialogue. These criteria exclude the following passages, which are in themselves similar to messenger-speeches:

Hec. 98-153. The Chorus brings Hecuba the news "of the decision in the Greek assembly that Polyxena must be sacrificed to the shade of Achilles, and give a vivid account of the debate in the manner of a messenger".[1]

Criterium 2: +; criteria 1 and 3: –.

Hec. 1132-82. Polymestor tells how Hecuba and her attendants killed his children and blinded him.[2]

Criteria 2 and 3: +; criterium 1: –.

Tro. 1123-55. Talthybius brings Astyanax' body to Hecuba for burial.

Criterium 1: +; criteria 2 and 3: –.

Ba. 434-50. A servant brings the stranger/Dionysus, who has been taken captive on Pentheus' orders.[3]

Criteria 1 and 2: +; criterium 3: –.

Ba. 616-41. The stranger/Dionysus tells of the miracles which have taken place inside the palace.

Criteria 2 and 3: +; criterium 1: –.

IA 414-39. A herald announces to Agamemnon the arrival of Clytemnestra and Iphigeneia.

Criterium 1: +; criteria 2 and 3: –.

Mechanema messenger-speeches

Messenger-speeches marked with an asterisk describe the outcome of an intrigue; I call these *mechanema* messenger-speeches.[4] A *mechanema* is a trap set for someone or an intrigue plotted against someone; not seldom it results in the death of the victim, who unwittingly participates in his or her own downfall. Thus in *Med.* Jason is made an instrument in the destruction of his own bride and father-in-law; in *El.* Aegisthus is

[1] Grube 109, and cf. Kitto 217.

[2] Cf. Strohm 268.

[3] Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1948: 83 ("the practice of the Greek theatre requires that the audience should depend upon a Messenger for an account of sensational events. This function the Stranger now performs"); Foley 1980: 113.

[4] Cf. Solmsen and Erdmann 131-66.

kept in the dark about Orestes' identity and thus participates in his own 'sacrifice'. In its fullest form a *mechanema* plot involves three phases: (1) onstage planning or announcement; (2) onstage execution (victim misled by means of words); (3) offstage execution (victim misled 'physically'):[5] e.g. in *IT* the intrigue against Thoas is planned onstage in 1017-55; executed onstage in 1153-1233; reported as executed offstage in 1327-1419. The second phase (onstage execution) is lacking in *Andr.*, *El.*, *HF*, *Ion*, and *Or.* (2). Sometimes the offstage execution is partly overheard, partly reported (*HF* and *Or.* (2)).

I do not agree with Erdmann 157, who considers *IT* (1) and *Ba.* (1) as *mechanema* messenger-speeches. In *IT* (1) the fight is open right from the beginning, while in *Ba.* (1), though the herdsmen at first hide themselves, their victims (prey) are never misled concerning the hostile intentions of the herdsmen. Conversely, I include *Or.* (2), which Erdmann 167-73 lists under "Sonderformen" (obviously because of its extraordinary lyric form).

Remarks

– The beginning of the messenger's narrative does not always coincide with the beginning of his speech (e.g. in *Hec.* the speech begins in 518, the narrative in 521), but since these introductory lines serve a function similar to that of the evaluations found at the end of each messenger-speech, I have included them in my discussion; the numbers given are those of the beginning and end of the speech.

– In the case of the messenger-speech in *Alc.*, there is something to be said for including lines 201-8,[6] in which the Messenger tells what Alcestis and Admetus are doing now. As many scholars have noted, this messenger-speech comes remarkably early on in the play; this has led some of them (Rassow 18, Henning 66, Grube 25, Strohm 268) to

[5] As such the *mechanema* plot is an example of what Pfister 209 calls "multiple presentation": "in all, there are three steps involved in the presentation of an action or a chain of events: first, the verbally mediated phase in which the action is planned or announced; secondly, the scenic realisation of the action; thirdly, the verbally mediated retrospective narrative which recapitulates it or informs the audience of it."

[6] Cf. Erdmann 102, note 3 who calls them an "Extra-Partie".

conclude that it is not a messenger-speech at all. But since it meets my three criteria, I have, like Erdmann 16, included it.

- In *Heracl.* 883-91 the Messenger, at the request of Alcmene, provides some extra information. The speeches 799-866 and 928-40 must derive from different persons (after 862-3 one does not expect the speaker to reappear on stage), and I think that Rassow was right in changing L's attribution (799-866: servant (sc. of 630ff.), 928-40: Messenger) into 799-866: Messenger and 928-40: servant.

- In *Supp.* 752-77 the messenger-speech is followed by a dialogue, in which Adrastus asks the Messenger for further information.[7]

- *Hel.* (1) is very brief, for obvious reasons: at the moment the Messenger recognizes Helen he can spare himself the trouble of recounting in more detail her disappearance (cf. Erdmann 16-7). This first Messenger of *Hel.* plays a role in the scene to follow (see Kannicht 168).

- In the case of *Ph.*, one could say that there are two messenger-speeches, each consisting of two parts (Lesky 450, Grube 364, and 366, Müller-Goldingen 172 and 207), or four messenger-speeches, whereby one messenger presents two speeches at a time. I have opted for the latter course (cf. Erdmann 114, n. 1), as each speech has a different story to tell.

- *Or.* (2) is remarkable not only because of its metre, but also because of its interrupted structure (see pp. 21-2). The messenger-speech is followed by a dialogue between the Phrygian and Orestes (1506-36).

[7] Collard 1975: 274 mentions as "analogies for a Euripidean messenger subsequently engaging in dialogue" *Hel.* 700ff. and *Rhes.* 335; one might add: *Heracl.* 883-91 and *Or.* 1506-36.

APPENDIX B

THE MESSENGER AS EYEWITNES

Med.		1167:	δεινὸν ἦν θέαμ' ἰδεῖν
		1196:	κάρτα δυσμαθὴς ἰδεῖν
		1202:	δεινὸν θέαμα
Heracl.		848:	εἰσιδών
Hipp.		1202:	φρικώδη κλύειν
		1207-8:	ἀφῃρέθη ... ὄμμα τοὐμὸν εἰσορᾶν
		1216-7:	εἰσορῶσι ... κρεῖσσον θέαμα δεργμάτων ἐφαίνετο
		1239:	δεινὰ ... κλύειν
Andr.		1123:	γοργὸς ὁπλίτης ἰδεῖν
Supp.		652:	ἔστην θεατής
		653:	ὁρῶ
		684:	λεύσσων
HF		1002:	ὡς ὁρᾶν ἐφαίνετο
IT	(1)	291:	παρῆν δ' ὁρᾶν
		308:	ἐσείδομεν
		320:	τὸ δεινὸν παρακέλευσμ' ἠκούσαμεν
		323:	εἴδομεν
	(2)	1345:	ὁρῶμεν
		1354:	ἐσείδομεν
Ion		1142:	θαύματ' ἀνθρώποις ὁρᾶν
Hel.	(2)	1540:	αὐχμηροὶ δ' ὁρᾶν
Ph.	(1)	1099:	εἰσορῶμεν
		1118:	εἰσορᾶν παρῆν
		1127:	ὥστε μαίνεσθαι δοκεῖν
		1139:	παρῆν ... θεάματα
		1165:	ὁρῶ
	(3)	1388:	τοῖς ὁρῶσιν
Or.	(1)	871:	ὁρῶ
		874:	ἰδών
		879:	ὁρῶ

	(2)	1456:	ἔδρακον (bis)
Ba.	(1)	680:	ὁρῶ
		693:	θαῦμ' ἰδεῖν
		760:	τὸ δεινὸν ἦν θέαμ' ἰδεῖν
	(2)	1050:	ὁρῷμεν
		1063:	θαῦμ' ὁρῶ
		1077:	οὐκέτ' εἰσορᾶν παρῆν

APPENDIX C

HISTORIC PRESENTS IN THE MESSENGER-SPEECH

Alc. 176: λέγει
183: κυνεῖ
184: δεύεται
186: στείχει
Med. 1141: κυνεῖ
1161: σχηματίζεται
1163: διέρχεται
1169: χωρεῖ, φθάνει
1173*: ὁρᾷ
1190: φεύγει
1195: πίτνει
1205: προσπίτνει
1207: κυνεῖ [v.l. κύνει]
Heracl. 859: αἱρεῖ
Hipp. 1188: μάρπτει
1212: χωρεῖ
1218: ἐμπίπτει
1221: ἕλκει
1224: φέρουσιν
1237: ἕλκεται
1246: πίπτει
Andr. 1111: ἔρχεται
1113: τυγχάνει
1117: προσεύχεται
1119: κεντοῦσ'
1120: χωρεῖ
1121: ἐξέλκει
1124: βοᾷ
1140: χωρεῖ
1149: πίτνει
1152: πίτνει
1153: προσφέρει
Hec. 528: αἴρει
529: σημαίνει
567: τέμνει
574: πληροῦσιν
Supp. 653: ὁρῶ
696: χωρεῖ
706: φεύγει
El. 777: κυρεῖ
779: ἀυτεῖ
783: ἐννέπει
790: ἐννέπει
814: λέγει
822: ἀπωθεῖ
830: σκυθράζει, ἀνιστορεῖ
838: κόπτει
854: στέφουσι
HF 956: ἔχει, σκευάζεται
964: ἐννέπει
969: ὠθεῖ, σκευάζεται
975: βοᾷ
976: βοᾷ
979: βάλλει
986: φθάνει
988: αὐδᾷ
995: χωρεῖ
996: φθάνει
997: κλῄει
999: σκάπτει, μοχλεύει
1001: ἱππεύει

1006: πίτνει
IT (1) 284: βοᾷ
298: παίει
301*: ὁρᾷ
307: πίπτει
329: εὐτύχει
330: χειρούμεθα
334: κομίζομεν
(2) 1345: ὁρῶμεν
1395: ὠθεῖ [v.l. ὤθει]
Ion 1143: περιβάλλει
1193: δίδωσι, λέγει
1196: ἐσπίπτει
1207: θνῄσκει
1210: βοᾷ
1213: ἐρευνᾷ
1217: θεῖ
1219: λέγει
Hel.(2) 1596: βοᾷ
Ph. (1) 1099: εἰσορῶμεν
1154: βοᾷ
1165: ὁρῶ
1169: ἐξαθροίζεται
1181: βάλλει
1186: πίπτει
(3) 1392: τίθησι
1401: χωρεῖ
1410: ἀμφέρει
1415: πίτνει
1429: προσπίτνει
1452: τίθησι
1458: ὠθεῖ
1459: κεῖται
Or. (1) 871: ὁρῶ
879: ὁρῶ
887: ἀνίσταται
902: ἀνίσταται
944: νικᾷ
(2) 1444: ἄγει, ἄγει
1461: ἐννέπουσι
1475: βοηδρομοῦμεν
Ba. (1) 680: ὁρῶ
705: ἐκπηδᾷ
728: κυρεῖ
748: χωροῦσι
(2) 1063: ὁρῶ
1112: πίπτει
1115: προσπίτνει
1117: λέγει

Remarks

– Verses marked with an asterisk contain a historic present in a subordinate clause.
– Note in *Andr.* 1112-3 the dependent *optative* clause after ἔρχεται.
– The presents found at the end of messenger-speeches, when the time of narration and narrated time coincide (e.g. *Med.* 1220: κεῖνται, *Andr.* 1159: κομίζομεν) have naturally been disregarded here. I have, however, included κεῖται in *Ph.* 1459, since it appears from 1476-7 that at the moment of speaking Jocaste's body is being brought back from the battle-field, and hence is no longer lying there.

- For θαυμάζομεν in *Med.* 1144, see Chapter 1, n. 89.
- The form καθήμεθα in *IT* 296 and 1342 is ambiguous: Erdmann takes it as a historic perfect, the Concordance of Italie as imperfect. I am inclined to favour the latter view.

APPENDIX D

THE INTERNAL ADDRESSEES OF THE MESSENGER-SPEECH

Alc.:		chorus (men of Pherae)
Med.:		chorus (Corinthian women) + Medea
Heracl.:		chorus (old men of Marathon) + Alcmene
Hipp.:		chorus (women of Troezen) + Theseus
Andr.:		chorus (Phthian girls) + Peleus
Hec.:		chorus (female Trojan captives) + Hecuba
Supp.:		chorus (Argive women) + Adrastus
El.:		chorus (Argive girls) + Electra
HF:		chorus (men of Thebes)
IT	(1):	chorus (Greek female servants of Iphigeneia) + Iphigeneia
	(2):	chorus + Thoas
Ion:		chorus (Athenian female servants of Creusa)
Hel.	(1):	chorus (Greek female servants of Helen) + Menelaus, Helen
	(2):	chorus + Theoclymenus
Ph.	(1):	chorus (Phoenician girls) + Jocasta
	(2):	chorus (Phoenician girls) + Jocasta
	(3):	chorus + Creon
	(4):	chorus + Creon
Or.	(1):	chorus (Argive women) + Electra
	(2):	chorus
Ba.	(1):	chorus (Asiatic maenads) + Pentheus, the stranger/Dionysus
	(2):	chorus

Remarks

– Since in the messenger-speech of *HF* Heracles was acting without knowing what he was doing, the content of the messenger-speech must be told to him again. This is done in 1113-45 by Amphitryon.
– In *Ion* the Messenger wants to tell Creusa his news, but cannot find her. The chorus then persuades him to tell it to them. When Creusa enters the stage in 1250-1, it appears that she has already been informed.

– In *Ph.* 1088-9 Jocasta announces that she will tell the Messenger's news to Oedipus.
– From *Or.* 1554-9 we may infer that the Phrygian Messenger repeated his report to Menelaus in more or less the same words (note the repetition of διssοῖν λεόντοιν and ἄφαντος οἴχεται).
– In *Ba.* 1222 and 1230 Cadmus appears to be informed about the dramatic events on Mt. Cithaeron by 'somebody' (τις).

APPENDIX E

CONCLUDING EVALUATIONS

(G = general, S = specific)

Alc.		196-8	S
Med.		1224-30	G
Heracl.		863-6	G
Hipp.		1249-54	S
Andr.		1161-5	S+G
Hec.		580-2	S
Supp.		726-30	G
El.		857-8	S
HF		1014-5	S
IT	(1)	336-9	S
	(2)	1411-9	S
Ion		1227-8	S
Hel.	(1)	-	
	(2)	1617-8	G
Ph.	(1)	1196-9	S
	(2)	1259-63	S
	(3)	1424	S
	(4)	1478-9	S
Or.	(1)	953-6	S
	(2)	1500-2	S
Ba.	(1)	769-74	S+G
	(2)	1150-2	G

Remarks

– Note that many concluding evaluations are introduced by τοιοῦτος or τοιόσδε (see Collard 1975, ad *Supp.* 726-30): *Alc.* 196, *Andr.* 1161, *Hec.* 580, *Supp.* 726, *IT* 336, 338; or by (μὲν) οὖν: *Hipp.* 1249, *HF* 1014, *Ba.* 769.

- In *Andr.* 1161-5 and *Ba.* 769-74 we have a combination of specific (*Andr.* 1161-3, *Ba.* 769-72) and general (*Andr.* 1164-5, *Ba.* 773-4) evaluations.
- In *IT* (2) and *Ph.* (2) the evaluation concerns the future rather than the past: the Messenger advises his internal protagonist-addressee what to do, in the light of the situation he has just reported (cf. also *Or.* 953-6 and *Ba.* 769-75).
- Due to the sudden ending of his story at the sight of Helen, the Messenger of *Hel.* (1) has no time to make an evaluation. However, his extended presence on stage allows him to do so in 744-60 (see Kannicht ad l.).
- According to Bond ad *HF* 1014f, *Ph.* (3) is the only messenger-speech without an evaluation. I disagree: in *Ph.* 1423-4 the Messenger finishes his story with πίπτουσιν ἄμφω, adding as his conclusion κοὐ διώρισαν κράτος: the duel has not brought the desired solution.

(N.B. the passage *Supp.* 909-17 is incorrectly mentioned by Bond as another instance of a comment by a messenger, since it is Adrastus speaking here).

APPENDIX F

COMPARISONS

Alc.:		–	
Med.:		1181-2:	ἤδη δ' ἀνελθὼν κῶλον ἔκπλεθρον δρόμου ταχὺς βαδιστὴς τερμόνων ἂν ἥπτετο
		1200:	ὥστε πεύκινον δάκρυ
		1213:	ὥστε κισσὸς ἔρνεσιν δάφνης
Heracl.:		–	
Hipp.:		1186:	θᾶσσον ἢ λέγοι τις
		1201:	ὡς βροντὴ Διός
		1221:	ὥστε ναυβάτης ἀνήρ
Andr.:		1140-1:	ὅπως πελειάδες ἱέρακ' ἰδοῦσαι
Hec.:		560-1:	ὡς ἀγάλματος
Supp.:		–	
El.:		824-5:	θᾶσσον δὲ βύρσαν ἐξέδειρεν ἢ δρομεὺς δισσοὺς διαύλους ἱππίους διήνυσεν
HF:		974:	ὄρνις ὥς
IT:	(1)	284:	†κυναγὸς ὥς†
		297:	λέων ὅπως
	(2)	–	
Ion:		–	
Hel.:		–	
Ph.:	(1)	1154:	τυφὼς ... ὥς τις
		1169:	κυναγὸς ὡσεί
		1185:	ὡς κύκλωμ' Ἰξίονος
	(2)	–	
	(3)	1377:	πυρσὸς ὥς
	(4)	–	
Or.:	(1)	882:	ὥστ' ἀδελφόν
	(2)	1404:	οἷος Ὀδυσσεύς
		1459:	ὡς κάπροι ... ὀρέστεροι
		1479-80:	οἷος οἷος Ἕκτωρ ὁ Φρύγιος ἢ τρικόρυθος Αἴας
		1492:	οἷα ... Βάκχαι

Ba.:	(1) 746-7:	θᾶσσον ... ἢ σὲ ξυνάψαι βλέφαρα βασιλείοις κόραις
	748:	ὥστ' ὄρνιθες
	752:	ὥστε πολέμιοι
	(2) 1056:	ἐκλιποῦσαι ποικίλ' ὡς πῶλοι ζυγά
	1066-9:	ὥστε τόξον ἢ κυρτὸς τροχὸς τόρνῳ γραφόμενος περιφορὰν ἕλκει δρόμον· ὣς κλῶν' ὄρειον ὁ ξένος χεροῖν ἄγων ἔκαμπτεν ἐς γῆν
	1090:	πελείας ὠκύτητ' οὐχ ἥσσονες
	1141-2:	ὡς ὀρεστέρου ... λέοντος

Remarks

– In five cases the comparison is not introduced by ὡς or a similar word: *Hipp.* 1186, *El.* 824-5, *Ba.* 746-7 and 1090 are so called comparative comparisons: "Vergleiche ... die statt durch ein Vergleichswort durch das "als" beim Komparative mit dem übrigen Teil des Satzes verbunden werden" (Kurtz 36). In *Med.* 1181-2 the comparison takes the form of an *irrealis*.

– It appears that comparisons are not a regular feature of all messenger-speeches. Thus none are found in the messenger-speeches in *Alc.*, *Heracl.*, *Supp.*, *IT* (2), *Ion*, *Hel.* (1) and (2), *Ph.* (2) and (4). Their absence from 'Iliadic' battle messenger-speeches (*Heracl.*, *Supp.*, *Ph.*) confirms the opinion of Bassi and others (cf. p. 87) that the messenger-speech is not epic as regards its comparisons.

APPENDIX G

SIGNS OF THE 'YOU'

Alc.:	–	
Med.:	1136:	τέκνων σῶν
	1138:	σοῖς ... κακοῖς
	1140:	σὲ καὶ πόσιν σόν
	1144:	ἀντὶ σοῦ
	1145:	τέκνων σῶν
	1149:	πόσις ... σός
	1158:	παῖδας σέθεν
	1188:	σῶν τέκνων
	1222:	τὸ ... σόν
	1223:	γνώσῃ
Heracl.:	832:	αὐχεῖς
	853:	κλύειν ... πάρεστί σοι
	856:	σὸν ... παῖδα
Hipp.:	1177:	ἐκ σοῦ
	1249:	σῶν δόμων, ἄναξ (vocative)
	1251:	τὸν σὸν ... παῖδ'
Andr.:	1135:	ἂν εἶδες
	1159:	σοι
	1160:	πρέσβυ
Hec.:	518:	γύναι
	519:	σῆς παιδός
	522:	σῆς κόρης
	526:	μόσχου σῆς
	580-1:	σῆς ... παιδός
	581:	σε
Supp.:	–	
El.:	803:	μητρὸς εὐνέτης σέθεν
	808:	σέ
	814:	σῷ κασιγνήτῳ
	854:	σοῦ κασιγνήτου

(*El.*)		855:	σοί
		857:	στυγεῖς
HF:		–	
IT	(1):	335:	σοι
		336:	ηὔχου, ὦ νεᾶνι, σοί
		337:	ἀναλίσκῃς
		338:	τὸν σὸν ... φόνον
IT	(2):	1329:	σὺ ... συμπέμπεις
		1335:	σοῖσι προσπόλοις, ἄναξ (vocative)
		1365:	πρὸς σ'
		1409:	πρὸς σέ
		1417:	σοι
Ion:		–	
Hel.	(1):	605:	ἄλοχος σή
	(2):	1530:	σῶν ... νεωρίων
		1552:	τοὺς σοὺς λόγους
		1553:	συνέχεας
		1595:	ναυβάταις ... τοῖσι σοῖς
		1610:	σῶν ναυβατῶν
		1616:	σοι
Ph.	(1):	1095:	σὸς παῖς
		1123:	ὁ σὸς ... Πολυνείκης
		1144:	σὸς ... γόνος
		1150:	εἶδες ἄν
		1164:	παῖς σός
		1169:	παῖς σός
	(2):	1219:	τὼ παῖδε τὼ σώ
		1236:	σὸς ... Πολυνείκης γόνος
		1259:	ἔχεις
		1260:	στεῖχ', ἐρήτυσον
		1262:	σοι
	(3):	1357:	οἶσθ'
	(4):	–	
Or.	(1):	867:	ἀμφὶ σοῦ
		868:	σῷ ... πατρί
		869:	σὸς δόμος

(*Or.*)		880:	σὸν σύγγονον
		888:	σῷ πατρί
		890:	πατέρα ... σόν
		891:	σὸν ... σύγγονον
		899:	σέ
		914:	σέ
		931:	σὸς ... σύγγονος
		945:	σε
		949:	σὺν σοί
		951:	σοι
		953:	εὐτρέπιζε
		954:	σε
		955:	σ'
Or.	(2):	1401:	σοι
Ba.	(1):	682:	μήτηρ 'Αγαύη σή
		686:	ὡς σὺ φῄς
		689:	ἡ σὴ ... μήτηρ
		712-3:	εἰ παρῆσθα, ...ψέγεις ...ἂν μετῆλθες
		737:	ἂν προσεῖδες
		740:	εἶδες ... ἄν
		747:	σὲ ξυνάψαι
		760:	ἄναξ (vocative)
		769:	ὦ δέσποτα
		770:	δέχου
	(2):	1085:	ἂν ἤκουσας

APPENDIX H

DIRECT AND INDIRECT SPEECH

A. Direct speech

Alc.: 163-9 (Alcestis)
177-82 (Alcestis)

Med.: 1151-5 (Jason)
1207-10 (Creon)

Heracl.: 804-10 (Hyllus)
826-7 (Athenian general)
839-40: (Athenian and Argive general)

Hipp.: 1182-4 (Hippolytus)
1191-3 (Hippolytus)
1240-2 (Hippolytus)

Andr.: 1092-5 (Orestes)
1104-5 (Delphian)
1106-8 (Neoptolemus)
1125-6 (Neoptolemus)

Hec.: 532-3 (Talthybius)
34-41 (Neoptolemus)
47-52 (Polyxena)
563-5 (Polyxena)
577-80 (Greeks)

Supp.: 669-72 (Athenian herald)
702 (Athenian and Theban soldiers)
711-2 (Theseus)

El.: 779-80 (Aegisthus)
781-2 (Orestes)
784-9 (Aegisthus)
791-2 (Aegisthus)
793-6 (Orestes)
805-7 (Aegisthus)
815-8 (Aegisthus)
831 (Orestes)
831-3 (Aegisthus)
834-7 (Orestes)
847-51 (Orestes)

HF: 936-46 (Heracles)
952 (one of the servants)
965-7 (Amphitryon)
975-6 (Alcmene)
982-3 (Heracles)
988-9 (one of Heracles' sons)

IT (1): 267-8 (a herdsman)
270-4 (another herdsman)
285-91 (Orestes)
321-2 (Orestes)

(2): 1358-60 (Taurian sailors)
1361-3 (Orestes)
1386-9 (a voice)
1398-1402 (Iphigeneia)

Ion: 1128-31 (Xuthus)
1178-80 (Old Man)
1210-2 (Ion)

1220-1 (Ion)

Hel. (1): 608-15 (Helen's phantom)

(2): 1543-6 (Menelaus)
1560-4 (Menelaus)
1579-80 (Egyptian captain)
1581 (Menelaus)
1584-7 (Menelaus)
1589-91 (an Egyptian)
1593-5 (Menelaus)
1597-9 (Egyptian boatsman)
1603-4 (Helen)

Ph. (1): 1145-7 (Tydeus and Polyneices)

(2): 1225-35 (Eteocles)
1250-1 (friends of Polyneices)
1252-3 (friends of Eteocles)

(3): 1365-8 (Polyneices)
1373-6 (Eteocles)

(4): 1432-3 (Jocaste)
1436-7 (Antigone)
1444-53 (Polyneices)

Or. (1): 875-6 (Messenger)
877-8 (Argive citizen)
885-7 (Argive herald)
932-42 (Orestes)

(2): 1438-43 (Orestes)
1447 (Pylades)
1461-4 (Orestes and Pylades)
1466 (Helen)

Ba. (1): 718-21 (a herdsman)
731-3 (Agave)

(2): 1059-62 (Pentheus)
1079-81 (Dionysus)
1106-9 (Agave)
1118-21 (Pentheus)

B. Indirect speech

Heracl.: 811-2 (Athenian and Argive army)
828-9 (Argive general)
844-5 (Iolaus)
851-2 (Iolaus)

Hipp.: 1175-7 (herald)
1205 (Hippolytus' servants)

Andr.: 1147-8 (τις)

Hec.: 553-4 (Agamemnon)

Supp.: 724-5 (Theseus)

El.: 809-10 (Orestes)

HF: 947-8 (Heracles)
954-5 (Heracles)
958 (Heracles)

IT (1): 276-8 (third herdsman)
336-7 (Iphigeneia)
1344 (Taurian soldiers)

Ion: 1167-8 (herald)
1191-3 (Ion)
1215-6 (Old Man)
1222-5 (Old Man)

Hel. (1): 1551 (servants)

Ph. (1): 1174-6 (Kapaneus)

(2): 1224 (Eteocles)

Or. (1): 889-93 (Talthybius)

899-900 (Diomedes)
914-6 (Argive citizen)
923-9 (farmer)
946 (Orestes)

Or. (2): 1419 (Phrygian servants)
Ba. (2): 1145-7 (Agave)

Remarks

The beginning and end of embedded direct speeches do not necessarily coincide with the beginning and end of a verse, as they do in Homer. Speeches may even effectfully be interrupted by the messenger: *El.* 788-9 (the interruption stresses the irony of the situation: Aegisthus is more or less forcing his arch-enemy Orestes into his house); *HF* 988 (enhances the pathos and effect of the disjunction of Ὦ φίλτατ’ ... πάτερ); *Ph.* 1452 (increases the pathos of Polyneices’ death before his mother’s eyes).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

* Abbreviations of journals according to Marouzeau.

R. Aélion, "Songes et prophéties dans la tragédie d'Eschyle: une forme de mise en abyme", Lalies 3, 1984, 133-46.

H. von Arnim, *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Medea*, Berlin ^{2}1886.

W.G. Arnott, "Euripides and the Unexpected", G&R 20, 1973, 49-64.

W.G. Arnott, "Double the Vision: a Reading of Euripides' *Electra*", G&R 28, 1981, 179-92.

W.G. Arnott, "Off-Stage Cries and the Choral Presence. Some Challenges to Theatrical Conventions in Euripides", Antichthon 16, 1982, 35-43.

D. Bain, *Actors and audience. A study of asides and related conventions in Greek drama*, Oxford 1977.

M. Bal, *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, Toronto 1985.

S.A. Barlow, *The Imagery of Euripides. A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language*, London 1971.

S.A. Barlow, "Structure and Dramatic Realisation in Euripides' *Heracles*", G&R 29, 1982, 115-25.

S.A. Barlow, *Euripides Trojan Women*, Warminster 1986.

W.S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964.

D. Bassi, "Il nunzio nella tragedia greca", RFIC 27, 1899, 50-89.

L. Bergson, *L'épithète ornementale dans Eschyle, Sophocle et Euripide*, Uppsala 1956.

G.W. Bond, *Euripides Heracles*, Oxford 1981.

E.B. Bongie, "Heroic elements in the *Medea* of Euripides", TAPhA 107, 1977, 27-56.

W. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, Chicago 1961.

J.M. Bremer, "Euripides *Heracles* 581", CQ 22, 1972, 236-40.

J.M. Bremer, "Why Messenger-speeches?", in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*, ed. J.M. Bremer, S. Radt, and C.J. Ruijgh, Amsterdam 1976, 29-48.

J.M. Bremer, S. Radt, and C.J. Ruijgh (eds.), *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*, Amsterdam 1976.

D.L. Burgess, *Late Euripidean narrative*, Ph.D. diss. Bryn Mawr college 1984.

P. Burian, "Euripides' Heraclidae: an Interpretation", CPh 72, 1977, 1-21.

A.P. Burnett, "Human Resistance and Divine Persuasion in Euripides' Ion", CPh 57, 1962, 89-103.

A.P. Burnett, "Pentheus and Dionysus. Host Guest", CPh 65, 1970, 15-29.

A.P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides Plays of Mixed Reversal*, Oxford 1971.

T.V. Buttrey, "Accident and Design in Euripides' Medea", AJPh 79, 1958, 1-17.

C. Collard, *Euripides Supplices I, II*, Groningen 1975.

C. Collard, *Euripides*. New Surveys in the Classics 14, Oxford 1981.

D.J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama. Myth, Theme and Structure*, Toronto 1967.

D.J. Conacher, *Euripides Alcestis*, Warminster 1988.

E. Craik, *Euripides Phoenician Women*, Warminster 1988.

M.J. Cropp, *Euripides Electra*, Warminster 1988.
A.M. Dale, *Euripides Alcestis*, Oxford ^{2}1961.
A.M. Dale, *Euripides Helen*, Oxford 1967.
J.D. Denniston, *Euripides Electra*, Oxford 1939.
J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford ^{2}1954.
J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae* I, II, Oxford 1984, 1981.
E.R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford ^{2}1960.
K. Elam, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, London, N.Y. 1980.
A. Elliott, *Euripides Medea*, Oxford 1969.
E.B. England, *The Iphigeneia among the Tauri of Euripides*, London 1960 (= 1886).
H. Erbse, "Euripides' *Alkestis*", Philologus 116, 1972, 32-52.
G. Erdmann, *Der Botenbericht bei Euripides*, diss. Kiel 1964 (typescript).
A.M. van Erp Taalman Kip, *Reader and Spectator*, Amsterdam 1990.
C. Eucken, "Das Rechtsproblem im euripideischen *Orest*", MH 43, 1986, 155-68.
J. Fischl, *De nuntiis tragicis*, diss. Wien 1910.
H.P. Foley, "The Masque of Dionysus", TAPhA 110, 1980, 107-33.
H.P. Foley, *Ritual Irony; Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides*, Ithaca, N.Y. 1985.
E. Fränkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon* I-III, Oxford 1950.
N. Friedman, "Point of View in Fiction. The Development of a Critical Concept", Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 70, 1955, 1160-84.
H. Friis Johansen, *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis*, Copenhagen 1959.
R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, Zetemata 44, München 1976.
G.H. Gellie, "Hecuba and Tragedy", Antichthon 14, 1980, 30-44.
G.H. Gellie, "The Character of Medea", BICS 35, 1988, 15-22.
G. Genette, "Discours du récit", in *Figures III*, Paris 1971.
M. Glowinski, "On the First-Person Novel", New Literary History 9, 1977, 103-114.
B. Goff, "Euripides' Ion 1132-1165: the Tent", PCPhS 34, 1988, 42-54.
L.H.G. Greenwood, *Aspects of Euripidean Tragedy*, Cambridge 1953.
L. di Gregorio, *Le scene d'annunzio nella tragedia greca*, Milano 1967.
J. Gregory, "Euripides' *Heracles*", YClS 25, 1977, 259-75.
J. Gregory, "Euripides' *Alcestis*", Hermes 107, 1979, 259-70.
J. Gregory, "Some Aspects of Seeing in Euripides' *Bacchae*", G&R 32, 1985, 23-31.
J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford 1980.
B.A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque Grecque*, Amsterdam 1958.
G.M.A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides*, London ^{2}1961.
T. Hägg, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, Stockholm 1971.
M. Heath, *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, London 1987.
R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, Leipzig, Berlin 1976 (= ^{3}1915).
E. Henning, *De tragicorum Atticorum narrationibus*, diss. Göttingen 1910.
N.C. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides. Form and Function of the Scenic Space*, Athens 1965.
W. Jens (ed.), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*, München 1971.

K. Joerden, "Zur Bedeutung des Ausser- und Hinterszenischen", in *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*, ed. W. Jens, München 1971, 369-413.

I.J.F. de Jong, "*Iliad* 1.366-392: A Mirror Story", Arethusa 18, 1985 1-22.

I.J.F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, Amsterdam 1987a.

I.J.F. de Jong, "The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-speeches in the *Iliad*", Eranos 85, 1987b, 69-84.

I.J.F. de Jong, "Silent characters in the Iliad", in *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, ed. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong, and J. Kalff, Amsterdam 1987c, 105-21.

I.J.F. de Jong, "Three Off-Stage Characters in Euripides", Mnemosyne 43, 1990, 1-21.

C.H. Kahn, *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek*. Foundations of language, supplementary series 16, Dordrecht, Boston 1973.

R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena, I, II*, Heidelberg 1969.

J. Keller, *Struktur und dramatische Funktion des Botenberichts bei Aischylos und Sophokles*, diss. Tübingen, typescript 1959.

G.S. Kirk, *The Bacchae by Euripides*. A Translation with Commentary, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1970.

H.D.F. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy. A Literary Study*, London [3]1961.

B.M.W. Knox, "The *Medea* of Euripides", YCS 25, 1977, 193-227.

B.M.W. Knox, "Euripides", in P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Cambridge 1985, 316-39.

H. Koller, "Praesens historicum und erzählendes Imperfekt. Beitrag zur Aktionsart der Praesensstammzeiten im Lateinischen und Griechischen", MH 8, 1951, 63-99.

P.D. Kovacs, *The Andromache of Euripides. An interpretation*, Chicago 1980.

R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II 1-2, Hannover 1976 (= 1898).

W. Kullmann, "Zum Sinngehalt der euripideischen *Alkestis*", A & A 13, 1967, 127-49.

E. Kurtz, *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise in den Tragödien des Euripides*, Amsterdam 1985.

M. Lacroix, *Les Bacchantes d'Euripide*, Paris 1976.

M.L. Lang, *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, Boston 1984.

R. Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy*, London 1964.

H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, München [2]1973.

K.H. Lee, *Euripides Troades*, Hampshire, London 1976.

D.F.W. van Lennep, *Euripides. Selected Plays, Part I, the Alkestis*, Leiden 1949.

A. Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, Göttingen [3]1972.

J. Lintvelt, *Essai de typologie narrative. Le "point de vue"*, Paris 1981.

R. Löhrer, *Mienenspel und Maske in der griechischen Tragödie*, Paderborn 1927.

W. Ludwig, *Sapheneia. Ein Beitrag zur Formkunst im Spätwerk des Euripides*, Tübingen 1954.

Th. Mann, "Versuch über das Theater", in *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. P. de Mendelssohn, Frankfurt 1986.

D. Mastronarde, "Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*", CSCA 8, 1975, 163-76.

L. Méridier, *Euripide Hippolyte*, Paris [2]1956.

A.N. Michelini, *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*, Wisconsin 1987.
G. Müller, "Beschreibung von Kunstwerken im *Ion* des Euripides", Hermes 103, 1975, 25-44.
C. Müller-Goldingen, *Untersuchungen zu den Phönissen des Euripides*, Palingenesia 22, Wiesbaden, Stuttgart 1985.
G. Murray, *Euripides Fabulae III*, Oxford ^{2}1913.
G. Murray, *Euripides and his Age*, London ^{2}1946.
H. Oranje, *Euripides' Bacchae. The Play and its Audience*, Leiden 1984.
W.A.A. van Otterlo, *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition*, Amsterdam 1944.
A.S. Owen, *Euripides Ion*, Oxford 1939.
R.Th. van der Paardt, "Various Aspects of Narrative Technique in Apuleius' Metamorphoses", in *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, ed. B.L. Hijmans and R.Th. van der Paardt, Groningen: 1978, 75-94.
D.L. Page, *Euripides Medea*, Oxford 1938.
O. Panagl, *Die "dithyrambischen Stasima" des Euripides. Untersuchungen zur Komposition und Erzähltechnik*, Diss. Univ. Wien 65, 1971.
O. Panagl, "Zur Funktion der direkten Reden in den "dithyrambischen Stasima" des Euripides", WS 6, 1972, 5-18.
R.S. Pathmanathan, "Death in Greek Tragedy", G & R 12, 1965, 2-14.
A.C. Pearson, *The Heraclidae*, Cambridge 1907.
M. Pfister, *The Theory and Analysis of Drama* (transl. from the German by J. Halliday), Cambridge 1988.
A.J. Podlecki, *The Persians by Aeschylus*. A Translation with Commentary, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1970.
M. Pohlenz, *Die Griechische Tragödie. Mit Erläuterungen*. Göttingen ^{2}1954.
G. Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*, The Hague 1982.
J. Rassow, *Quaestiones selectae de Euripideorum nuntiorum narrationibus*, diss. Greifswald 1883.
A. Rijksbaron, "How Does a Messenger Begin His Speech? Some Observations on the Opening-lines of Euripidean Messenger-speeches", in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*, ed. J.M. Bremer, S. Radt, and C.J. Ruijgh, Amsterdam 1976a, 293-308.
A. Rijksbaron, *Temporal and Causal Conjunctions in Ancient Greek*, Amsterdam 1976b.
A. Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, Amsterdam 1984.
B. Romberg, *Studies in the Narrative Technique of the First-person Novel*, Lund 1962.
J. de Romilly, *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide*, Paris 1956.
J. de Romilly, *L'évolution du pathétique d'Eschyle à Euripide*, Paris 1961.
J. de Romilly, *Réflexions parallèles chez Euripide et Thucydide*, Amsterdam 1984.
J. de Romilly, *La modernité d'Euripide*, Paris 1986.
J. Ros, *Die μεταβολή (Variation) als Stilprinzip des Thukydides*, Paderborn, Zürich, Wien 1938.
J. Roux, *Euripide. Les Bacchantes*, I, II, Paris 1972.

D.A. Russell and M. Winterbottom (eds.), *Ancient Literary Criticism. The Principle Texts in New Translations*, Oxford 1972.

S. Said, "Euripide ou l'attente déçue: l'exemple des *Phéniciens*", ASNP 15, 1985, 501-27.

G. Schepens, *L''autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du Ve siècle avant J.C.*, Brussel 1980.

W. Schmid and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I.3, München 1961 (= 1940).

C. Schneider, *Information und Absicht bei Thukydides*, Hypomnemata 41, Göttingen 1974.

C. Segal, "Curse and Oath in Euripides' *Hippolytus*", Ramus 1, 1972, 165-80.

C. Segal, "The Menace of Dionysus: Sex Roles and Reversals in Euripides' *Bacchae*", Arethusa 11, 1978, 185-202.

C. Segre, *Teatro e romanzo. Due tipi di comunicazione letteraria*, Torino 1984.

B. Seidensticker, "Sacrificial Ritual in the *Bacchae*", in *Arktouros*. Hellenic Studies Presented to B.M.W. Knox, Berlin 1979, 181-90.

F. Solmsen, "Zur Gestaltung des Intriguenmotive in den tragödien des Sophokles und Euripides", Philologus 87, 1932, 1-17.

J.M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, Heidelberg 1907.

W.B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme. A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*, Oxford ^{2}1963.

W.B. Stanford, *Greek Tragedy and the Emotions. An Introductory Study*, London, Boston, Melbourne, Henley 1983.

D.P. Stanley-Porter, *Messenger-Scenes in Euripides*, diss. London 1968 (typescript).

F. Stanzel, *Typische Formen des Romans*, Göttingen 1964.

F. Stanzel, *Theorie des Erzählens*, Göttingen 1982.

P.T. Stevens, *Euripides Andromache*, Oxford 1971.

H. Strohm, "Beobachtungen zum *Rhesos*", Hermes 87, 1959, 257-74.

W. Suerbaum, "Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus. Überlegungen zur epischen Technik der *Odyssee*", Poetica 2, 1968, 150-77.

A. Svensson, *Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Griechischen*, Lund 1930.

O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, Oxford 1977.

O. Taplin, *Greek Tragedy in Action*, London 1978.

A.D. Trendall and T.B.L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek drama*, London 1971.

B.A. Uspenskij, *Poetik der Komposition. Struktur des künstlerischen Textes und Typologie der Kompositionsform*, Frankfurt a. Main 1975.

P. Vellacott, *Euripides Orestes and Other Plays*. Translation and Introduction, Harmondsworth 1972.

P. Vellacott, *Ironic Drama. A Study of Euripides' Method and Meaning*, Cambridge 1975.

P. Walcot, *Greek Drama in its Theatrical and Social Context*, Cardiff 1976.

N. Wecklein, *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Iph. im Taurierland*, Leipzig, Berlin ^{3}1904.

N. Wecklein, *Euripides Orestes*, Leipzig, Berlin 1906.

N. Wecklein, *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Hippolytus*, Leipzig, Berlin ²1908.
N. Wecklein, *Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Medea*, Leipzig, Berlin: ⁴1909.
N. Wecklein, *Euripides Andromache*, Leipzig, Berlin 1911.
H. Weil, *Euripide Hécube*, Paris 1905.
H. Weil, *Euripide Iphigénie en Tauride*, Paris 1907.
H. Weil, *Euripide Hippolyte*, Paris 1913.
H. Weinrich, *Besprochene und erzählte Welt*, Stuttgart ²1971.
M.L. West, *Euripides Orestes*, Warminster 1987.
U. von Wilamowitz, *Griechische Tragödien III*, Berlin 1922.
U. von Wilamowitz. *Euripides Herakles*, Band III, Darmstadt 1959 (= ²1895).
C.W. Willink, *Euripides Orestes*, Oxford 1986.
R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus: An Interpretation of the Bacchae*, Cambridge 1948.
R.P. Winnington-Ingram, "Euripides: Poiètès Sophos", Arethusa 2, 1969, 129-42.
R.P. Winnington-Ingram, "The Delphic temple in Greek tragedy", in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*, ed. J.M. Bremer, S. Radt, and C.J. Ruijgh, Amsterdam 1976, 483-500.
C. Wolff, "The Design and Myth in Euripides' *Ion*", HSCPh 69, 1965, 169-94.
N. Wolfson, "A Feature of Performed Narrative: the Conversational Historic Present", Language in Society 7, 1978, 215-37.
G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Manchester 1963 (= 1955).

INDEX LOCORUM

Aeschylus

A.

636-80 2 (n. 4)
659 9 (n. 20)

Pers.

266-7 9 (n. 20)
266 11 (n. 25)
302-514 73
353-432 38
402-5 135 (n. 50)
447-71 38
480-514 2 (n. 4)

Th.

490 9 (n. 20)

Euripides

Alc.

79-85 119 (n. 7)
152-98 7, 107, 122, 150
171-4 74
176 41-2
183 41-2
184 41-2
186 41-2
189-90 99
192 7
197-8 76
995-1008 126

Andr.

1085-1165 20-1, 43, 106, 137, 161
1085 4, 5 (n. 11), 47
1087 4
1088-99 29
1102 4
1109-11 52-3, 95
1111 43 (n. 117)
1114-6 53
1114-5 152-3
1115 101
1117-9 79
1119 101
1125-8 57-8
1127-8 147
1135-6 97-8
1135 105
1138-40 82-3
1140-1 88
1144-5 83
1145-6 147, 148 (n. 73)
1146 96 (n. 89)
1147-8 16
1149-50 101
1153 44 (n. 119)
1154-5 82
1157 83
1163 101

Ba.

38 158 (n. 98)
218-9 158 (n. 98)
629 14 (n. 32)
638 14 (n. 32)
657-8 123
677-774 105, 107, 122-3, 158-9
680 48
682 99
686-8 23
689 99
707 16 (n. 37)
712-22 51
712 105
728-30 5
728 42 (n. 115)
737 105
740 105
748-9 93
751-4 92-3

755-8 74 (n. 35)
760 10 (n. 21)
764 16 (n. 37)
765-8 20
769 23-4
770-4 76 (n. 42)
976 126 (n. 25)
1043-1152 10 (n. 21), 36-7, 59, 107, 159-60
1044 5 (n. 11)
1045-7 4
1047 36
1051-3 159
1058-60 26-7
1058-9 48-9
1063 44 (n. 121), 49 (n. 132)
1078-9 15-6
1084-5 147-8
1085 105
1095 96
1098-1104 163
1107-9 59
1115-7 144
1137-8 160
1139-42 93-4
1144-5 81
1151 5 (n. 11)
1222 190
1230 190

El.
639 126
774-858 37, 107, 111-2, 132-4, 137, 153-4, 161-2
759-60 119
761-3 172 (n. 130)
774-5 4 (n. 9)
774 5 (n. 11), 34
776 84
777-8 153
777 43 (n. 117)
788-9 201
790 4 (n. 9)
803-7 98
819 86 (n. 65)
824-5 91
826-9 28
839-43 176-7
844-5 21
845-7 85

Hec.
342-78 128 (n. 31)
518-82 105 (n. 111), 106, 127-8, 153
518-20 30-1
527-30 43
529-33 5
547-52 128 (n. 31)
558-62 142-3
560-1 88-9
567 43 (n. 116)
568-70 28
577-80 137 (n. 54)
582 5 (n. 11)
591-2 64 (n. 4)
672-3 64 (n. 4)
1162 93 (n. 81)

Hel.
605-21 129, 182
607 156
619 5 (n. 11)
1526-1618 55-6, 104, 107, 137
1531 85 (n. 64)
1537 53 (n. 145)
1549 14 (n. 32)
1570 86 (n. 66)
1593-5 135 (n. 50)
1597-9 135 (n. 50)
1603-4 135 (n. 50)
1606 105

Heracl.
392 10 (n. 21)
748-83 125 (n. 21), 119 (n. 7)
799-866 106, 127
801 5 (n. 11)

804-10	137 (n. 54)
813-7	77
826-7	135 (n. 50)
828-40	182
830-3	145-6
839-40	135
847-8	11
856-7	10 (n. 23)
859-60	42-3
863-6	75
875-85	125 (n. 21)

HF

922-1015	106, 128-9, 162, 165-71
922-7	155
922	159 (n. 100)
925	81 (n. 56)
930	147, 148 (n. 73)
931	165 (n. 115)
934	86 (n. 66)
936-46	165-6
946	166
947-9	166
950-2	14-5, 77 (n. 44)
953-7	167
959-62	168
967-9	168
969-70	86
974	89
979	43 (n. 116)
981	145
982-3	137 (n. 54)
986-9	100
988	201
993	81
994-5	169-70
995-1001	43
995	170
998-1000	170
1002-3	16 (n. 37)
1012	10 (n. 21)
1014-5	76
1015	5 (n. 11)
1032-3	108 (n. 126)
1113-45	189

Hipp.

1173-1254	106, 127, 137, 146-7, 152
1173-5	34, 47
1174	5 (n. 11)
1185	7 (n. 14)
1186	91
1187	96 (n. 89)
1188	43 (n. 117)
1196	96 (n. 89)
1199	159 (n. 100)
1201-5	14-5
1201-2	92
1204-5	77 (n. 44)
1215-6	10
1223	84
1225	84
1237	85 (n. 64)
1245	84
1248	14 (n. 32)
1249-51	97
1254	5 (n. 11)

Ion

978	102
1048-73	125 (n. 21)
1118	16
1122-1228	7, 102, 107, 163
1132-65	156
1139	10 (n. 23)
1143	43 (n. 117)
1171	59-60
1182-6	50
1183	50
1184-6	15
1184	86 (n. 65)
1186	96 (n. 89)
1188	102
1193	42 (n. 114)
1194	147, 148 (n. 73)
1196	42 (n. 115)
1207-8	86
1207	43 (n. 116)

1216 138
1222-3 95-6

IT
260-339 6-7, 18, 106, 122, 155
261 5 (n. 11)
262 159 (n. 100)
264-8 49-50
267-78 35 (n. 90)
275-6 51
281-314 164
296-8 90
298 42 (n. 115)
301-3 7 (n. 14)
308 9
312 86 (n. 66)
316-8 26
320 9
321-2 137 (n. 54)
323 9
328-9 17, 44
329 7 (n. 14)
336-7 7 (n. 13)
337-8 7 (n. 13)
458-62 64
932 64 (n. 4)
1051 126 (n. 25)
1295 10 (n. 21)
1327-1419 18 (n. 45), 32 (n. 78), 54-5, 104, 106-7
1327-8 54
1327 4 (n. 9), 5 (n. 11)
1329 35 (n. 89)
1336-8 54
1340-1 14 (n. 32), 35 (n. 90)
1343-5 44
1356-7 85
1364-6 68
1383 85
1409-10 31
1414-9 16-7

Med.
774-89 125
947-75 125
952 125 (n. 19)
957 125 (n. 19)
958 125 (n. 19)
978-88 125
1002-4 125
1065-6 125
1136-1230 35-6, 106, 124-5, 160-1
1137 151
1139-40 97
1141 81 (n. 56)
1144 35 (n. 89), 96 (n. 89)
1145-9 142
1160-5 42
1161-2 46
1161 85 (n. 64)
1164 86 (n. 66)
1167 10 (n. 21), 49
1169 42
1171-3 24
1172 35
1177-9 100
1185 35 (n. 91)
1187 85 (n. 64)
1189 81 (n. 56)
1190 42
1195-1202 175-6
1195-6 46-7
1202 10 (n. 21)
1208-10 58 (n. 153)

Or.
253-76 165
866-956 5, 107, 130, 138
866-71 44
866 5 (n. 11)
872-3 10 (n. 23), 157
875-6 35 (n. 90)
879 44 (n. 121)
915-6 23 (n. 57)
932-42 137 (n. 54)
943 79
952 10 (n. 21)
1353-65 125 (n. 21)

1359 119 (n. 7)
1395-1502 21-3, 32, 51-2, 107, 110-11, 123-4
1408-10 96-7
1416-7 7 (n. 14)
1418-24 14 (n. 32)
1438-43 137 (n. 54)
1441-2 158
1444 42 (n. 114)
1445 51
1447 137 (n. 54)
1457 86 (n. 66)
1459-61 90
1461-4 137 (n. 54)
1468 86 (n. 66)
1478-81 90-1
1493-8 18
1554-9 190

Ph.
1090-1199 99, 107, 129, 156-7
1104-38 163
1139-40 11
1139 10 (n. 21)
1145-7 135 (n. 50)
1150 105
1161-2 78
1165 44
1170-1 4
1172-4 83-4
1172 72-3
1181 16 (n. 37), 43 (n. 116)
1185 91-2
1187-90 25-6
1217-63 7, 99, 107, 129-30
1224 5 (n. 10)
1242-3 101
1250-1 135 (n. 50)
1252-3 135 (n. 50)
1284-1306 125 (n. 21)
1334 10 (n. 21)
1356-1424 7, 107, 128
1358 10 (n. 21)
1364 141-2
1372-3 141-2
1388-9 77 (n. 44)
1392 43 (n. 117)
1416-7 27
1423-4 192
1427-79 107, 128
1437-41 143
1452 201
1461 96 (n. 89)

Supp.
598-633 125 (n. 21)
647-9 9
650-730 67, 103-4, 106, 128
650-1 48
651-3 9-10
655 10 (n. 23), 152 (n. 85)
669-72 137 (n. 54)
673-4 147
684 11
686-90 72-3
702 135 (n. 50)
707 49 (n. 132)
710 144-5
711-2 135 (n. 50)
714-5 161
719-20 7
729 84 (n. 60)

Sophocles
Aj.
748 9 (n. 20)

Ant.
404 9 (n. 20)
407-40 2 (n. 4)
1192-1243 2 (n. 4)
1192 9 (n. 20)
1220 9 (n. 20)
1221 9 (n. 20)

El.
761-3 9 (n. 20)

OC
1586-1666 3 (n. 4)
1648 9 (n. 20)
1656-65 19 (n. 47)

OT
1237-85 2 (n. 4)
1237-8 172 (n. 130)
1254 9 (n. 20)
1263 9 (n. 20)

Tr.
464-7 9 (n. 20)
746-8 172, 11 (n. 25)
749-812 36 (n. 93)
752-3 159 (n. 100)
896-7 172
899 9 (n. 20)
912 9 (n. 20)
914-5 9 (n. 20)

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY A.D. LEEMAN, C.J. RUIJGH AND H.W. PLEKET

4. LEEMAN, A.D. *A Systematical Bibliography of Sallust (1879-1964)*. Revised and augmented edition. 1965. ISBN 90 04 01467 5
5. LENZ, F.W. (ed.). *The Aristeides 'Prolegomena'*. 1959. ISBN 90 04 01468 3
7. McKAY, K.J. *Erysichthon. A Callimachean Comedy*. 1962. ISBN 90 04 01470 5
8. SWEENEY, R.D. *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Scholia to Statius*. 1969. ISBN 90 04 01471 3
10. WITKE, C. *Enarratio Catulliana. Carmina L, XXX, LXV, LXVIII*. 1968. ISBN 90 04 03079 4
11. RUTILIUS LUPUS. *De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis*. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by E. Brooks. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01474 8
12. SMYTH, W.R. (ed.). *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01475 6
13. LEVIN, D.N. *Apollonius' 'Argonautica' re-examined*. 1. The Neglected First and Second Books. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02575 8
14. REINMUTH, O.W. *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 01476 4
15. YOUNG, D.C. *Pindar Isthmian 7*. Myth and Exempla. 1971. ISBN 90 04 01477 2
16. ROSE, K.F.C. *The Date and Author of the 'Satyricon'*. With an introduction by J.P. Sullivan. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02578 2
17. SEGAL, Ch. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02579 0
18. WILLIS, J. *De Martiano Capella emendando*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02580 4
19. HERINGTON, C.J. (ed.). *The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03455 2
20. THIEL, H. VAN. *Petron. Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02581 2
21. LOSADA, L.A. *The Fifth Column in the Peloponnesian War*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03421 8
22. STATIUS. *Thebaidos Liber Decimus*. Edited with a commentary by R.D. Williams. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03456 0
23. BROWN, V. *The Textual Transmission of Caesar's 'Civil War'*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03457 9
24. LOOMIS, J.W. *Studies in Catullan Verse*. An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Polymetra. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03429 3
25. PAVLOVSKIS, Z. *Man in an Artificial Landscape*. The Marvels of Civilization in Imperial Roman Literature. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03643 1
26. PARRY, A.A. *Blameless Aegisthus. A study of ἀμύμων and other Homeric epithets*. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03736 5
27. GEORGE, E.V. *Aeneid VIII and the Aitia of Callimachus*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03859 0
28. SCOTT, W.C. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03789 6
29. BERS, V. *Enallage and Greek Style*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03786 1
30. GEFFCKEN, K.A. *Comedy in the 'Pro Caelio'*. With an Appendix on the *In Clodium et Curionem*. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03782 9
31. STARR, C.G. *Political Intelligence in Classical Greece*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03830 2
32. BOEDEKER, D.D. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03946 5

33. MATTHEW, V.J. *Panyassis of Halikarnassos. Text and commentary.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 04001 3
34. POE, J.P. *Heroism and Divine Justice in Sophocles' Philoctetes.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 04165 6
35. EDEN, P.T. *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII.* 1975. ISBN 90 04 04225 3
36. SHANNON, R.S. *The arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique.* 1975. ISBN 90 04 04249 0
37. SMITH, O.L. *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus. 1. The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius.* 1975. ISBN 90 04 04220 2
38. HIJMANS, B.L. *Inlaboratus et facilis. Aspects of Structure in Some Letters of Seneca.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04474 4
39. SCHMELING, G.L. & J.H. STUCKEY. *A Bibliography of Petronius.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04753 0
40. WALLACH, B.P. *Lucretius and the Diatribe against the Fear of Death.* De rerum natura III 830-1094. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04564 3
41. ANDERSON, G. *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04735 2
42. CLADER, L.L. *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04721 2
43. ANDERSON, G. *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04760 3
44. THOMPSON, W.E. *De Hagniae Hereditate. An Athenian Inheritance Case.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04757 3
45. McGUSHIN, P. *Sallustius Crispus, 'Bellum Catilinae'. A Commentary.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04835 9
46. THORNTON, A. *The Living Universe. Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04579 1
47. MORGAN, K. *Ovid's Art of Imitation. Propertius in the 'Amores'.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04858 8
48. BRENK, F.E. *In Mist apparelled. Religious Themes in Plutarch's 'Moralia' and 'Lives'.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05241 0
49. HENRY, A.S. *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05429 4
50. NORTH, H.F. (ed.). *Interpretations of Plato. A Swarthmore Symposium.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05262 3
51. SUSSMAN, L.A. *The Elder Seneca.* 1978. ISBN 90 04 05759 5
52. WENDER, D. *The Last Scenes of the Odyssey.* 1978. ISBN 90 04 05710 2
53. NEWMYER, S.T. *The 'Silvae' of Statius.* Structure and theme. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05849 4
54. BORING, T.A. *Literacy in Ancient Sparta.* 1979. ISBN 90 04 05971 7
55. GRIFFITHS, F.T. *Theocritus at Court.* 1979. ISBN 90 04 05919 9
56. *The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana.* A critical Text with Prolegomena, Translation and Commentary by R.J. PENELLA. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05972 5
57. BOER, W. DEN. *Private Morality in Greece and Rome.* Some Historical Aspects. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05976 8
58. BRIGGS, W.W. *Narrative and Simile from the 'Georgics' in the 'Aeneid'.* 1980. ISBN 90 04 06036 7
59. CLAYMAN, D.L. *Callimachus' 'Iambi'.* 1980. ISBN 90 04 06063 4
60. JOHNSTON, P.A. *Vergil's Agricultural Golden Age. A Study of the 'Georgics'.* 1980. ISBN 90 04 06111 8
61. *Hieronymus' Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57).* Ein Kommentar von G.J.M. BARTELINK. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06085 5

62. MAEHLER, H. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*. I. Die Siegeslieder. 2 Bde. 1982. 1. Edition des Textes mit Einleitung und Übersetzung. 2. Kommentar. ISBN 90 04 06409 5
63. HOHENDAHL-ZOETELIEF, I.M. *Manners in the Homeric Epic*. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06223 8
64. HARVEY, R.A. *A Commentary on Persius*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06313 7
65. MAXWELL-STUART, P.G. *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology. 1. γλαυκός*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06406 0
66. MONTI, R.C. *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid*. Roman Social and Political Values in the Epic. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06328 5
67. MAXWELL-STUART, P.G. *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology. 2. χαροπός*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06407 9
68. ACHARD, G. *Pratique rhétorique et idéologie politique dans les discours 'Optimates' de Cicéron*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06374 9
69. MANNING, C.E. *On Seneca's 'Ad Marciam'*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06430 3
70. BERTHIAUME, G. *Les rôles du Mágeiros*. Etude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06554 7
71. CAMPBELL, M. *A commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica XII*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06502 4
72. CAMPBELL, M. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06503 2
73. MOSKALEW, W. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid*. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06580 6
74. RACE, W.H. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06515 6
75. MOORHOUSE, A.C. *The Syntax of Sophocles*. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06599 7
76. SARKISSIAN, J. *Catullus. An Interpretation*. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06939 9
77. WITKE, C. *Horace's Roman Odes*. A Critical Examination. 1983. ISBN 90 04 07006 0
78. ORANJE, J. *Euripides' 'Bacchae'*. The Play and its Audience. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07011 7
79. STATIUS. *Thebaidos Libri XII*. Recensuit et cum apparatu critico et exegetico instruxit D.E. Hill. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06917 8
80. KEBRIC, R.B. *The Paintings in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi and their historical context*. 1983. ISBN 90 04 07020 6
81. DAVID, E. *Aristophanes and Athenian Society of the Early 4th Century B.C.* 1984. ISBN 90 04 07062 1
82. DAM, H.-J. VAN. *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book II*. A Commentary. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07110 5
83. MINEUR, W.H. *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos*. Introduction and Commentary. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07230 6
84. OBER, J. *Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404-322 B.C.* 1985. ISBN 90 04 07243 8
85. HUBBARD, T.K. *The Pindaric Mind*. A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07303 5
86. VERDENIUS, W.J. *A Commentary on Hesiod: Works and Days*, vv. 1-382. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07465 1
87. HARDER, A. *Euripides' 'Kresphonthes' and 'Archelaos'*. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07511 9
88. WILLIAMS, H.J. *The 'Eclogues' and 'Cynegetica' of Nemesianus*. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07486 4

89. McGING, B.C. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07591 7
90. MINYARD, J.D. *Lucretius and the Late Republic.* An Essay in Roman Intellectual History. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07619 0
91. SIDEBOTHAM, S.E. *Roman Economic Policy in the Erythra Thalassa 30 B.C.-A.D. 217.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07644 1
92. VOGEL, C.J. DE. *Rethinking Plato and Platonism.* 2nd impr. of the first (1986) ed. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08755 9
93. MILLER, A.M. *From Delos to Delphi.* A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07674 3
94. BOYLE, A.J. *The Chaonian Dove.* Studies in the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid of Virgil. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07672 7
95. KYLE, D.G. *Athletics in Ancient Athens.* 1987. ISBN 90 04 07861 4
96. SUTTON, D.F. *Seneca on the Stage.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07928 9
97. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. I. Olympian Odes 3, 7, 12, 14.* 1987. ISBN 90 04 08126 7
98. PROIETTI, G. *Xenophon's Sparta.* An introduction. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08338 3
99. BREMER, J.M., A.M. VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP & S.R. SLINGS. *Some Recently Found Greek Poems.* Text and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08319 7
100. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN. *Hephaestion on Metre.* Translation and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08452 5
101. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. II.* Olympian Odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08535 1
102. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *Time holds the Mirror. A Study of Knowledge in Euripides' 'Hippolytus'.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08601 3
103. MARCOVICH, M. *Alcestis Barcinonensis.* Text and Commentary. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08600 5
104. HOLT, F.L. *Alexander the Great and Bactria.* The Formation of a Greek Frontier in Central Asia. Repr. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08612 9
105. BILLERBECK, M. *Senecas Tragödien: sprachlicher und stilistische Untersuchungen.* Mit Anhängen zur Sprache des Hercules Oetaeus und der Octavia. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08631 5
106. ARENDS, J.F.M. *Die Einheit der Polis. Eine Studie über Platons Staat.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08785 0
107. BOTER, G.J. *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08787 7
108. WHEELER, E.L. *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08831 8
109. BUCKLER, J. *Philip II and the Sacred War.* 1989. ISBN 90 04 09095 9
110. FULLERTON, M.D. *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09146 7
111. ROTHWELL, K.S. *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes' 'Ecclesiazusae'.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09185 8
112. CALDER, W.M. & A. DEMANDT. *Eduard Meyer. Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09131 9
113. CHAMBERS, M.H. *Georg Busolt. His Career in His Letters.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09225 0
114. CASWELL, C.P. *A Study of 'Thumos' in Early Greek Epic.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09260 9
115. EINGARTNER, J. *Isis und ihre Dienerinnen in der Kunst der römischen Kaiserzeit.* 1991. ISBN 90 04 09312 5
116. JONG, I. DE. *Narrative in Drama.* The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09406 7
117. BOYCE, B.T. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius'.* Cena Trimalchionis. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09431 8